W.W. Grainger, Inc.

2024 CDP Corporate Questionnaire 2024

Word version

Important: this export excludes unanswered questions
This document is an export of your organization's CDP questionnaire response. It contains all data points for questions that are answered or in progress. There may be questions or data points that you have been requested to provide, which are missing from this document because they are currently unanswered. Please note that it is your responsibility to verify that your questionnaire response is complete prior to submission. CDP will not be liable for any failure to do so.
Terms of disclosure for corporate questionnaire 2024 - CDP

.

10/30/2024, 02:31 pm

Contents

C1. Introduction

(1.1) In which language are you submitting your response?

Select from:
☑ English

(1.2) Select the currency used for all financial information disclosed throughout your response.

Select from:
☑ USD

(1.3) Provide an overview and introduction to your organization.

(1.3.2) Organization type

Select from:
☑ Publicly traded organization

(1.3.3) Description of organization

W.W. Grainger, Inc., is a leading broad line distributor with operations primarily in North America, Japan and the United Kingdom. At Grainger, We Keep The World Working by serving more than 4.5 million customers worldwide with products delivered through innovative technology and deep customer relationships. With 2023 sales of 16.5 billion, the Company operates two business models. In the High-Touch Solutions segment, Grainger offers approximately 2 million maintenance, repair and operating (MRO) products and services, including technical support and inventory management. In the Endless Assortment segment, Zoro.com offers customers access to more than 13 million products, and MonotaRO.com offers more than 22 million products. For more information, visit www.grainger.com.
[Fixed row]

(1.4) State the end date of the year for which you are reporting data. For emissions data, indicate whether you will be providing emissions data for past reporting years.

	End date of reporting year	Alignment of this reporting period with your financial reporting period	Indicate if you are providing emissions data for past reporting years
	12/31/2023	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(1.4.1) What is your organization's annual revenue for the reporting period?

16500000000

(1.5) Provide details on your reporting boundary.

(1.5.1) Is your reporting boundary for your CDP disclosure the same as that used in your financial statements?

Select from:

☑ No

(1.5.2) How does your reporting boundary differ to that used in your financial statement?

For our emissions reporting boundary, we use operational control. This means we include activities in which our organization and subsidiaries have the full authority to introduce or implement operating policies. For our financial reporting, the Consolidated Financial Statements include the accounts of W.W. Grainger, Inc. and its subsidiaries over which our organization exercises control. All significant intercompany transactions are eliminated from the Consolidated Financial Statements. The reporting boundary between our emissions reporting and financial reporting are similar, but there are some nuances such as our onsite offerings in which we operate within a customer's site. Emissions from those activities are not included in our Scope 1 & Scope 2 inventory as we do not have direct control within those operations, but are included in Scope 3. The financial impact of our onsite offerings are included in our financial reporting.

[Fixed row]

(1.6) Does your organization have an ISIN code or another unique identifier (e.g., Ticker, CUSIP, etc.)?

ISIN code - bond

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

ISIN code - equity

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

CUSIP number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

384802104

Ticker symbol

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(1.6.2) Provide your unique identifier

GWW

SEDOL code

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

LEI number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

D-U-N-S number

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

Other unique identifier

(1.6.1) Does your organization use this unique identifier?

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(1.7) Select the countries/areas in which you operate.

Select all that apply

☑ China

☑ India

☑ Japan

☑ Panama

☑ Poland

☑ Czechia

☑ Canada
☑ Mexico
☑ Malaysia
☑ Thailand
☑ Indonesia
☑ South Africa
☑ Republic of Korea
☑ Hungary
☑ Ireland
☑ Hong Kong SAR, China
☑ United Arab Emirates
☑ United States of America
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(1.24) Has your organization mapped its value chain?

(1.24.1) Value chain mapped

Select from:
☑ Yes, we have mapped or are currently in the process of mapping our value chain

(1.24.2) Value chain stages covered in mapping

Select all that apply
☑ Upstream value chain
☑ Downstream value chain

(1.24.3) Highest supplier tier mapped

Select from:
☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(1.24.4) Highest supplier tier known but not mapped

Select from:
☑ All supplier tiers known have been mapped

(1.24.7) Description of mapping process and coverage

At Grainger, we conduct ESG materiality assessments to maintain a sharp, thoughtful focus on the topics most critical to our business and key stakeholders. The results of the assessments inform our ESG program and overall strategy. As we keep pace with an evolving ESG landscape, we routinely update our assessment to stay current, with our most recent materiality assessment completed in 2024. We engaged a third-party consulting firm to assist with our 2024 materiality assessment. The assessment adopted a double-materiality-informed approach, which differed from previous years by considering not only the financial significance of topics on our business, but also the impact Grainger may have on the environment, people and society more broadly. As part of the process, we completed a high-level value chain mapping exercise across our finalized list of relevant ESG topics to identify dependencies and impacts on people and the environment. More information about our Materiality Assessment approach can be found in our 2024 ESG Report on GraingerESG.com.
[Fixed row]

C2. Identification, assessment, and management of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(2.1) How does your organization define short-, medium-, and long-term time horizons in relation to the identification, assessment, and management of your environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities?

Short-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

0

(2.1.3) To (years)

1

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

This time horizon aligns with our financial reporting time horizons. Our financial reporting time horizons correspond with the SEC's definition of short-term and long-term, where short-term is defined as anything within the next 12 months and long-term is anything beyond 12 months (1 year). As such, we don't define a specific medium-term time horizon.

Medium-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.3) To (years)

1

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

This time horizon aligns with our financial reporting time horizons. Our financial reporting time horizons correspond with the SEC's definition of short-term and long-term, where short-term is defined as anything within the next 12 months and long-term is anything beyond 12 months (1 year). As such, we don't define a specific medium-term time horizon.

Long-term

(2.1.1) From (years)

1

(2.1.2) Is your long-term time horizon open ended?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.1.4) How this time horizon is linked to strategic and/or financial planning

This time horizon aligns with our financial reporting time horizons. Our financial reporting time horizons correspond with the SEC's definition of short-term and long-term, where short-term is defined as anything within the next 12 months and long-term is anything beyond 12 months (1 year). As such, we don't define a specific medium-term time horizon.
[Fixed row]

(2.2) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies and/or impacts?

	Process in place	Dependencies and/or impacts evaluated in this process
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both dependencies and impacts

[Fixed row]

(2.2.1) Does your organization have a process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental risks and/or opportunities?

	Process in place	Risks and/or opportunities evaluated in this process	Is this process informed by the dependencies and/or impacts process?
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select from:* ☑ Both risks and opportunities	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(2.2.2) Provide details of your organization's process for identifying, assessing, and managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and/or opportunities.

Row 1

(2.2.2.1) Environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(2.2.2.2) Indicate which of dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities are covered by the process for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Dependencies

☑ Impacts

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(2.2.2.3) Value chain stages covered

Select all that apply

☑ Direct operations

☑ Upstream value chain

☑ Downstream value chain

(2.2.2.4) Coverage

Select from:

☑ Full

(2.2.2.5) Supplier tiers covered

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(2.2.2.7) Type of assessment

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(2.2.2.8) Frequency of assessment

Select from:

☑ More than once a year

(2.2.2.9) Time horizons covered

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Long-term

(2.2.2.10) Integration of risk management process

Select from:

☑ Integrated into multi-disciplinary organization-wide risk management process

(2.2.2.11) Location-specificity used

Select all that apply

☑ Not location specific

(2.2.2.12) Tools and methods used

Enterprise Risk Management

☑ COSO Enterprise Risk Management Framework

☑ Enterprise Risk Management

☑ Internal company methods

International methodologies and standards

☑ IPCC Climate Change Projections

Other

☑ Desk-based research

☑ External consultants

☑ Materiality assessment

☑ Partner and stakeholder consultation/analysis

☑ Scenario analysis

(2.2.2.13) Risk types and criteria considered

Acute physical

☑ Drought

☑ Tornado

☑ Wildfires

☑ Heat waves

☑ Heavy precipitation (rain, hail, snow/ice)

☑ Flood (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, ground water)

☑ Storm (including blizzards, dust, and sandstorms)

☑ Cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

☑ Increased severity of extreme weather events

☑ Precipitation or hydrological variability

☑ Sea level rise

☑ Temperature variability

Policy

☑ Changes to international law and bilateral agreements

☑ Changes to national legislation

☑ Poor coordination between regulatory bodies

☑ Poor enforcement of environmental regulation

Market

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of certified sustainable material

☑ Availability and/or increased cost of raw materials

☑ Changing customer behavior

☑ Uncertainty in the market signals

Reputation

☑ Impact on human health

☑ Increased partner and stakeholder concern and partner and stakeholder negative feedback

☑ Negative press coverage related to support of projects or activities with negative impacts on the environment (e.g. GHG emissions, deforestation & conversion, water stress)

☑ Other reputation, please specify **:**Anti-ESG stakeholder feedback

Technology

☑ Transition to lower emissions technology and products

Liability

☑ Exposure to litigation

☑ Non-compliance with regulations

(2.2.2.14) Partners and stakeholders considered

Select all that apply

☑ NGOs
☑ Customers
☑ Employees
☑ Investors
☑ Suppliers
☑ Regulators
☑ Local communities

(2.2.2.15) Has this process changed since the previous reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

(2.2.2.16) Further details of process

Climate-related risks are incorporated in Grainger's overall Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) processes. The ERM team uses the Company's Enterprise Risk Management Framework (RMF) to define, measure, and monitor risk across the organization. External benchmarking is conducted to determine applicable short-term and long-term risks for the organization. As part of this framework, there is an enterprise risk rating scale that provides guidelines for risk scoring/magnitude, which includes both quantitative and qualitative metrics across multiple dimensions. There is a quantitative metric that covers the financial dimension of risk. The risk rating scale quantifies risk magnitude through consideration of Impact and Likelihood ratings. Applying ratings to each risk helps to commonly measure and prioritize them in a consistent matter. Additionally, Grainger leaders and climate-related subject matter experts throughout the company support identification of relevant climate risks. There is a cross-functional team that collaborates to assess any identified emerging or evolving risks related to climate on an ongoing basis. The assessment process for a climate risk may include, but is not limited to, reviewing the risk and likelihood, evaluating the potential or actual financial significance, benchmarking, engaging with key stakeholders, leveraging third-party consultant perspectives, understanding current risk management activities, and tracking the current state. Grainger has implemented a specific process to track the financial impact of severe weather events on our business in order to better understand risks and opportunities related to such events. Grainger's Board and management team are engaged in assessing identified material risks and determining the appropriate response and prioritization.
[Add row]

(2.2.7) Are the interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed?

(2.2.7.1) Interconnections between environmental dependencies, impacts, risks and/or opportunities assessed

Select from:

☑ Yes

(2.2.7.2) Description of how interconnections are assessed

At Grainger, we conduct ESG materiality assessments to maintain a sharp, thoughtful focus on the topics most critical to our business and key stakeholders. The results of the assessments inform our ESG program and overall strategy. We engaged a third-party consulting firm to assist with our 2024 materiality assessment. The assessment adopted a double-materiality-informed approach, considering not only the financial significance of topics on our business, but also the impact Grainger may have on the environment, people and society more broadly. As part of the process, we completed a high-level value chain mapping exercise focusing on our finalized list of relevant ESG topics. This involved analyzing Grainger's value chain - from upstream activities through operations to downstream processes - to identify resource dependencies, interconnections, and assess impacts on both people and the environment. More information about our Materiality Assessment approach can be found in our 2024 ESG Report on GraingerESG.com.
[Fixed row]

C3. Disclosure of risks and opportunities

(3.1) Have you identified any environmental risks which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?

	Environmental risks identified
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, both in direct operations and upstream/downstream value chain

[Fixed row]

(3.1.1) Provide details of the environmental risks identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk1

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Cyclone, hurricane, typhoon

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Japan

☑ Mexico

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Inability to provide customers the products they want when they want them could significantly impact our results of operations and financial performance. Increased risk of severe weather, including cyclones, hurricanes, and typhoons can cause damage to our direct operations. In particular, there is potential risk to our business if a distribution center (DC) were to experience an outage or complete loss due to a cyclone or hurricane. We see risk for this specifically in Mexico (Monterrey), Japan, and coastal regions in the United States such as Florida, North Carolina, and Mississippi. As part of our risk management processes, Grainger conducts Business Impact Analyses to analyze risks and quantify major exposures to Grainger distribution centers within its supply chain, with the particular goal of quantifying the risk of a large-scale DC outage. It is typically updated on a three- to four-year cycle. The latest Business Impact (BI) analysis occurred in 2023. This analysis is reflective of all key U.S. distribution centers across the West, Midwest, South and Northeast. The outcomes include estimated business impact exposure (revenue minus variable expenses) and property damage costs. While the focus is on the U.S. for these analyses, the results provide us a high-level understanding of expected impacts in other geographies as well.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

If a total loss of a DC were to occur, Grainger expects potential loss of revenues due to business interruption, as well as property damage expenses. Depending on the size of the DC, volume handled at the DC, and other interdependencies, the total impact of a complete loss of DC is estimated to range from approximately 100M to 1B. This financial impact includes the total business impact exposure (revenue minus variable expense) and property damage combined. Because the figures here represent estimates, Grainger cannot guarantee the stated range of financial impact would be realized if this loss scenario were to occur.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

100000000

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

1000000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

In 2023, Grainger conducted a Business Impact Analysis in which the business interruption exposure from a major disruptive event causing complete loss of a DC was calculated for each of the 11 major US distribution centers. The methodology of the analysis assumed a major event completely destroys any one of the eleven DCs within the scope of the analysis. Annual Business Impact (BI) value was calculated using the following formula: BI Value Net Sales - Variable Expenses. BI Value was allocated to the 11 DCs based on project FY2024 revenue. Estimated impact figures reported in our response represent total exposure, which includes business impact and property damage estimates. A range estimate is given because the full financial impact from loss of a DC is dependent on the specific DC lost, as the DCs have varying sales activity and interdependencies, and thus business impact, and also would have varying property damage cost estimates. Given this methodology, the complete loss of one of Grainger's distribution centers could cost the business anywhere between approximately 100M and 1B. This estimated range assumes total loss and includes estimates for mitigation efforts (e.g., rerouting products, drop-shipping, team member overtime, etc.) and rebuild, as well as

corresponding financial impacts due to the assumed loss of sales and loss of inventory. Because the figures here represent estimates, Grainger cannot guarantee the stated range of financial impact would be realized if this loss scenario were to occur.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Improve maintenance of infrastructure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

445000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of management for this risk is related to the cost of maintaining and improving Grainger Properties and other critical assets to ensure resiliency against extreme weather events. In 2023, Grainger spent approximately 445,000,000 in capital expenditures related to distribution networks, inventory management, and technology enhancements.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

To mitigate and manage this risk, continuous engagement with risk management and external consultants occurs to ensure structures and operations are sound. Dynamic models have been developed to re-route orders should one or multiple portions of our operations be affected. Grainger's Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BCDR) planning helps minimize the impact of outages affecting Grainger customers. BCDR efforts include developing, implementing and enhancing business continuity processes in alignment with the ISO/IEC 22301 framework for Grainger's Business Continuity Management Programs (BCMPs). This standard provides the strategic direction for BCMPs and guides the establishment of activities aligned with the framework. BCMPs include a Business Impact Analysis, Risk Assessment, and other mitigation methods and tools. DCs invest in business continuity actions such as generators, satellite / cellular LAN backup, and air scrubbers. Timescale of implementation of mitigation strategies includes ongoing, long-term efforts. Specific supply chain deep-dives and mitigation strategy reviews are conducted regularly. The Business Impact Analysis is refreshed every 3 years. Short-term mitigation includes shifting order volume to other DCs. Additionally, in terms of network design, Grainger continues to expand its geographic footprint which adds contingency to our operations.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk2

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Tornado

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Inability to provide customers the products they want when they want them could significantly impact our results of operations and financial performance. Increased risk of severe weather, including tornadoes can cause damage to our direct operations. In particular, there is potential risk to our business if a distribution center (DC) were to experience an outage or complete loss due to a tornado. We anticipate higher risk of tornados that could cause significant damage to operations particularly in Illinois, Kentucky, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, and Texas. As part of our risk management processes, Grainger conducts Business Impact Analyses to analyze risks and quantify major exposures to Grainger distribution centers within its supply chain, with the particular goal of quantifying the risk of a large-scale DC outage. It is typically updated on a three- to four-year cycle. The latest Business Impact (BI) analysis occurred in 2023. This analysis is reflective of all key U.S. distribution centers across the West, Midwest, South and Northeast. The outcomes include estimated business impact exposure (revenue minus variable expenses) and property damage costs. While the focus is on the U.S. for these analyses, the results provide us a high-level understanding of expected impacts in other geographies as well.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

If a total loss of a DC were to occur, Grainger expects potential loss of revenues due to business interruption, as well as property damage expenses. Depending on the size of the DC, volume handled at the DC, and other interdependencies, the total impact of a complete loss of DC is estimated to range from approximately 100M to 1B. This financial impact includes the total business impact exposure (revenue minus variable expense) and property damage combined. Because the figures here represent estimates, Grainger cannot guarantee the stated range of financial impact would be realized if this loss scenario were to occur.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

100000000

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

1000000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

In 2023, Grainger conducted a Business Impact Analysis in which the business interruption exposure from a major disruptive event causing complete loss of a DC was calculated for each of the 11 major US distribution centers. The methodology of the analysis assumed a major event completely destroys any one of the eleven DCs within the scope of the analysis. Annual Business Impact (BI) value was calculated using the following formula: BI Value Net Sales - Variable Expenses. BI Value was allocated to the 11 DCs based on project FY2024 revenue. Estimated impact figures reported in our response represent total exposure, which includes business impact and property damage estimates. A range estimate is given because the full financial impact from loss of a DC is dependent on the specific DC lost, as the DCs have varying sales activity and interdependencies, and thus business impact, and also would have varying property damage cost estimates. Given this methodology, the complete loss of one of Grainger's distribution centers could cost the business anywhere between approximately 100M and 1B. This estimated range assumes total loss and includes estimates for mitigation efforts (e.g., rerouting products, drop-shipping, team member overtime, etc.) and rebuild, as well as corresponding financial impacts due to the assumed loss of sales and loss of inventory. Because the figures here represent estimates, Grainger cannot guarantee the stated range of financial impact would be realized if this loss scenario were to occur.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Improve maintenance of infrastructure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

445000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of management for this risk is related to the cost of maintaining and improving Grainger Properties and other critical assets to ensure resiliency against extreme weather events. In 2023, Grainger spent approximately 445,000,000 in capital expenditures related to distribution networks, inventory management, and technology enhancements.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

To mitigate and manage this risk, continuous engagement with risk management and external consultants occurs to ensure structures and operations are sound. Dynamic models have been developed to re-route orders should one or multiple portions of our operations be affected. Grainger's Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BCDR) planning helps minimize the impact of outages affecting Grainger customers. BCDR efforts include developing, implementing and enhancing business continuity processes in alignment with the ISO/IEC 22301 framework for Grainger's Business Continuity Management Programs (BCMPs). This standard provides the strategic direction for BCMPs and guides the establishment of activities aligned with the framework. BCMPs include a Business Impact Analysis, Risk Assessment, and other mitigation methods and tools. DCs invest in business continuity actions such as generators, satellite / cellular LAN backup, and air scrubbers. Timescale of implementation of mitigation strategies includes ongoing, long-term efforts. Specific supply chain deep-dives and mitigation strategy reviews are conducted regularly. The Business Impact Analysis is refreshed every 3 years. Short-term mitigation includes shifting order volume to other DCs. Additionally, in terms of network design, Grainger continues to expand its geographic footprint which adds contingency to our operations.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk3

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Wildfires

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Canada

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Inability to provide customers the products they want when they want them could significantly impact our results of operations and financial performance. Increased risk of drought and wildfires can cause damage to our direct operations. In particular, there is potential risk to our business if a distribution center (DC) were to experience an outage or complete loss due to wildfires. We anticipate higher risk of wildfires that could cause significant damage to operations particularly in California and Canada. As part of our risk management processes, Grainger conducts Business Impact Analyses to analyze risks and quantify major exposures to Grainger distribution centers within its supply chain, with the particular goal of quantifying the risk of a large-scale DC outage. It is typically updated on a three- to four-year cycle. The latest Business Impact (BI) analysis occurred in 2023. This analysis is reflective of all key U.S. distribution centers across the West, Midwest, South and Northeast. The outcomes include estimated business impact exposure (revenue minus variable expenses) and property damage costs. While the focus is on the U.S. for these analyses, the results provide us a high-level understanding of expected impacts in other geographies as well.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

If a total loss of a DC were to occur, Grainger expects potential loss of revenues due to business interruption, as well as property damage expenses. Depending on the size of the DC, volume handled at the DC, and other interdependencies, the total impact of a complete loss of DC is estimated to range from approximately 100M to 1B. This financial impact includes the total business impact exposure (revenue minus variable expense) and property damage combined. Because the figures here represent estimates, Grainger cannot guarantee the stated range of financial impact would be realized if this loss scenario were to occur.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

100000000

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

1000000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

In 2023, Grainger conducted a Business Impact Analysis in which the business interruption exposure from a major disruptive event causing complete loss of a DC was calculated for each of the 11 major US distribution centers. The methodology of the analysis assumed a major event completely destroys any one of the eleven DCs within the scope of the analysis. Annual Business Impact (BI) value was calculated using the following formula: BI Value Net Sales - Variable Expenses. BI Value was allocated to the 11 DCs based on project FY2024 revenue. Estimated impact figures reported in our response represent total exposure, which includes business impact and property damage estimates. A range estimate is given because the full financial impact from loss of a DC is dependent on the specific DC lost, as the DCs have varying sales activity and interdependencies, and thus business impact, and also would have varying property damage cost estimates. Given this methodology, the complete loss of one of Grainger's distribution centers could cost the business anywhere between approximately 100M and 1B. This estimated range assumes total loss and includes estimates for mitigation efforts (e.g., rerouting products, drop-shipping, team member overtime, etc.) and rebuild, as well as corresponding financial impacts due to the assumed loss of sales and loss of inventory. Because the figures here represent estimates, Grainger cannot guarantee the stated range of financial impact would be realized if this loss scenario were to occur.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Improve maintenance of infrastructure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

445000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of management for this risk is related to the cost of maintaining and improving Grainger Properties and other critical assets to ensure resiliency against extreme weather events. In 2023, Grainger spent approximately 445,000,000 in capital expenditures related to distribution networks, inventory management, and technology enhancements.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

To mitigate and manage this risk, continuous engagement with risk management and external consultants occurs to ensure structures and operations are sound. Dynamic models have been developed to re-route orders should one or multiple portions of our operations be affected. Grainger's Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BCDR) planning helps minimize the impact of outages affecting Grainger customers. BCDR efforts include developing, implementing and enhancing business continuity processes in alignment with the ISO/IEC 22301 framework for Grainger's Business Continuity Management Programs (BCMPs). This standard provides the strategic direction for BCMPs and guides the establishment of activities aligned with the framework. BCMPs include a Business Impact Analysis, Risk Assessment, and other mitigation methods and tools. DCs invest in business continuity actions such as generators, satellite / cellular LAN backup, and air scrubbers. Timescale of implementation of mitigation strategies includes ongoing, long-term efforts. Specific supply chain deep-dives and mitigation strategy reviews are conducted regularly. The Business Impact Analysis is refreshed every 3 years. Short-term mitigation includes shifting order volume to other DCs. Additionally, in terms of network design, Grainger continues to expand its geographic footprint which adds contingency to our operations.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk4

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Acute physical

☑ Flooding (coastal, fluvial, pluvial, groundwater)

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Canada

☑ Japan

☑ Mexico

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Inability to provide customers the products they want when they want them could significantly impact our results of operations and financial performance. Increased risk of severe flooding can cause damage to our direct operations. In particular, there is potential risk to our business if a distribution center (DC) were to experience an outage or complete loss due to flooding. We anticipate higher risk of severe flooding that could cause significant damage to operations particularly in the United States (e.g., Illinois, Florida, Kentucky, etc.), Japan, Mexico, and Canada. As part of our risk management processes, Grainger conducts Business Impact Analyses to analyze risks and quantify major exposures to Grainger distribution centers within its supply chain, with the particular goal of quantifying the risk of a large-scale DC outage. It is typically updated on a three- to four-year cycle. The latest Business Impact (BI) analysis occurred in 2023. This analysis is reflective of all key U.S. distribution centers across the West, Midwest, South and Northeast. The outcomes include estimated business impact exposure (revenue minus variable expenses) and property damage costs. While the focus is on the U.S. for these analyses, the results provide us a high-level understanding of expected impacts in other geographies as well.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Decreased revenues due to reduced production capacity

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

If a total loss of a DC were to occur, Grainger expects potential loss of revenues due to business interruption, as well as property damage expenses. Depending on the size of the DC, volume handled at the DC, and other interdependencies, the total impact of a complete loss of DC is estimated to range from approximately 100M to 1B. This financial impact includes the total business impact exposure (revenue minus variable expense) and property damage combined. Because the figures here represent estimates, Grainger cannot guarantee the stated range of financial impact would be realized if this loss scenario were to occur.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.1.1.23) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – minimum (currency)

100000000

(3.1.1.24) Anticipated financial effect figure in the long-term – maximum (currency)

1000000000

(3.1.1.25) Explanation of financial effect figure

In 2023, Grainger conducted a Business Impact Analysis in which the business interruption exposure from a major disruptive event causing complete loss of a DC was calculated for each of the 11 major US distribution centers. The methodology of the analysis assumed a major event completely destroys any one of the eleven DCs within the scope of the analysis. Annual Business Impact (BI) value was calculated using the following formula: BI Value Net Sales - Variable Expenses. BI Value was allocated to the 11 DCs based on project FY2024 revenue. Estimated impact figures reported in our response represent total exposure, which includes business impact and property damage estimates. A range estimate is given because the full financial impact from loss of a DC is dependent on the specific DC lost, as the DCs have varying sales activity and interdependencies, and thus business impact, and also would have varying property damage cost estimates. Given this methodology, the complete loss of one of Grainger's distribution centers could cost the business anywhere between approximately 100M and 1B. This estimated range assumes total loss and includes estimates for mitigation efforts (e.g., rerouting products, drop-shipping, team member overtime, etc.) and rebuild, as well as corresponding financial impacts due to the assumed loss of sales and loss of inventory. Because the figures here represent estimates, Grainger cannot guarantee the stated range of financial impact would be realized if this loss scenario were to occur.

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Improve maintenance of infrastructure

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

445000000

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

The cost of management for this risk is related to the cost of maintaining and improving Grainger Properties and other critical assets to ensure resiliency against extreme weather events. In 2023, Grainger spent approximately 445,000,000 in capital expenditures related to distribution networks, inventory management, and technology enhancements.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

To mitigate and manage this risk, continuous engagement with risk management and external consultants occurs to ensure structures and operations are sound. Dynamic models have been developed to re-route orders should one or multiple portions of our operations be affected. Grainger's Business Continuity and Disaster Recovery (BCDR) planning helps minimize the impact of outages affecting Grainger customers. BCDR efforts include developing, implementing and enhancing business continuity processes in alignment with the ISO/IEC 22301 framework for Grainger's Business Continuity Management Programs (BCMPs). This standard provides the strategic direction for BCMPs and guides the establishment of activities aligned with the framework. BCMPs include a Business Impact Analysis, Risk Assessment, and other mitigation methods and tools. DCs invest in business continuity actions such as generators, satellite / cellular LAN backup, and air scrubbers. Timescale of implementation of mitigation strategies includes ongoing, long-term efforts. Specific supply chain deep-dives and mitigation strategy reviews are conducted regularly. The Business Impact Analysis is refreshed every 3 years. Short-term mitigation includes shifting order volume to other DCs. Additionally, in terms of network design, Grainger continues to expand its geographic footprint which adds contingency to our operations.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk5

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Chronic physical

☑ Heat stress

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Canada

☑ Japan

☑ Mexico

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

Climate change may result in the number of high temperature days in locations in which we operate. This may cause operational challenges and expenses, as it may become increasingly difficult to keep our buildings at a temperature that is conducive of safe for working, particularly in our DCs. Efforts to keep our buildings operational during heat waves and / or increased temperatures may result in a significant increase in our operating expenses, or may result in disruption of business. We expect that this chronic physical climate risk could occur across our geographic footprint, including the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, Japan, and Mexico. Highest risk geographies are anticipated to be Texas, California, Mexico, and Japan.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased indirect [operating] costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ Unlikely

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Medium-low

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Climate change may result in the number of high temperature days in locations in which we operate. This may cause operational challenges and expenses, as it may become increasingly difficult to keep our buildings at a temperature that is conducive of safe for working, particularly in our DCs. Efforts to keep our buildings operational during heat waves and / or increased temperatures may result in a significant increase in our operating expenses, or may result in disruption of business.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Infrastructure, technology and spending

☑ Other infrastructure, technology and spending, please specify :Investment in technology, protocols, and measures to keep employees protected from heat exposure.

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Grainger is unable to provide a figure that quantifies the cost of response to this specific risk at this time.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Grainger has existing protocols and measures in place to protect our team members from heat exposure through methods such as team member training and communications, installing large overhead fans to increase air circulation, supplying cold water fill stations throughout our facilities, and providing immediate first aid care to any team member who has been affected by exposure to increased ambient indoor temperature

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk6

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Direct operations

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Canada

☑ Japan

☑ Mexico

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The potential impacts of climate change on Grainger's suppliers, product offerings, operations, facilities and customers are accelerating and uncertain. Increased public awareness and concern regarding global climate change have resulted in, and may continue to result in, more international, federal, and/or state or other

stakeholder requirements or expectations that have resulted in, and could continue to result in, more restrictive or expansive standards, such as stricter limits on greenhouse gas emissions or more prescriptive reporting of environmental, social, and governance metrics. There continues to be a lack of consistent climate change legislation and standards, which creates economic and regulatory uncertainty. New laws, regulations and enforcement could strain Grainger's suppliers and result in increased compliance-related costs, which could result in higher product costs that are passed to Grainger. New or changing environmental laws and regulations could also increase Grainger's operating costs, including through higher utility and transportation costs, and Grainger is unable to predict the potential impact such laws and regulations could have on its financial condition and results of operations.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased compliance costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Potential effects include increased compliance-related costs, higher product costs passed to Grainger from suppliers, increased operating costs including through higher utility or transportation costs. Grainger is unable to predict the potential impact such future and / or emerging laws and regulations could have on our financial condition and results of operations.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Other compliance, monitoring or target, please specify **:**Continued monitoring of and preparation for emerging or recently finalized regulations.

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Grainger is unable to provide a figure that quantifies the cost of response to this specific risk at this time.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Grainger continuously monitors the regulatory environment for emerging climate-related regulations to support preparation and compliance efforts.

Climate change

(3.1.1.1) Risk identifier

Select from:

☑ Risk7

(3.1.1.3) Risk types and primary environmental risk driver

Policy

☑ Changes to national legislation

(3.1.1.4) Value chain stage where the risk occurs

Select from:

☑ Upstream value chain

(3.1.1.6) Country/area where the risk occurs

Select all that apply

☑ Canada

☑ Japan

☑ Mexico

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

☑ United States of America

(3.1.1.9) Organization-specific description of risk

The potential impacts of climate change on Grainger's suppliers, product offerings, operations, facilities and customers are accelerating and uncertain. Increased public awareness and concern regarding global climate change have resulted in, and may continue to result in, more international, federal, and/or state or other stakeholder requirements or expectations that have resulted in, and could continue to result in, more restrictive or expansive standards, such as stricter limits on greenhouse gas emissions or more prescriptive reporting of environmental, social, and governance metrics. There continues to be a lack of consistent climate change legislation and standards, which creates economic and regulatory uncertainty. New laws, regulations and enforcement could strain Grainger's suppliers and result in increased compliance-related costs, which could result in higher product costs that are passed to Grainger. New or changing environmental laws and regulations could also increase Grainger's operating costs, including through higher utility and transportation costs, and Grainger is unable to predict the potential impact such laws and regulations could have on its financial condition and results of operations.

(3.1.1.11) Primary financial effect of the risk

Select from:

☑ Increased compliance costs

(3.1.1.12) Time horizon over which the risk is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ Short-term

☑ Long-term

(3.1.1.13) Likelihood of the risk having an effect within the anticipated time horizon

Select from:

☑ About as likely as not

(3.1.1.14) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(3.1.1.16) Anticipated effect of the risk on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the selected future time horizons

Potential effects include increased compliance-related costs, higher product costs passed to Grainger from suppliers, increased operating costs including through higher utility or transportation costs. Grainger is unable to predict the potential impact such future and / or emerging laws and regulations could have on our financial condition and results of operations.

(3.1.1.17) Are you able to quantify the financial effect of the risk?

Select from:

☑ No

(3.1.1.26) Primary response to risk

Compliance, monitoring and targets

☑ Other compliance, monitoring or target, please specify **:**Continued monitoring of and preparation for emerging or recently finalized regulations.

(3.1.1.27) Cost of response to risk

0

(3.1.1.28) Explanation of cost calculation

Grainger is unable to provide a figure that quantifies the cost of response to this specific risk at this time.

(3.1.1.29) Description of response

Grainger continuously monitors the regulatory environment for emerging climate-related regulations to support preparation and compliance efforts.
[Add row]

(3.5) Are any of your operations or activities regulated by a carbon pricing system (i.e. ETS, Cap & Trade or Carbon Tax)?

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not anticipate being regulated in the next three years

(3.6) Have you identified any environmental opportunities which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future?

	Environmental opportunities identified
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes, we have identified opportunities, and some/all are being realized

[Fixed row]

(3.6.1) Provide details of the environmental opportunities identified which have had a substantive effect on your organization in the reporting year, or are anticipated to have a substantive effect on your organization in the future.

Climate change

(3.6.1.1) Opportunity identifier

Select from:
☑ Opp1

(3.6.1.3) Opportunity type and primary environmental opportunity driver

Products and services

☑ Increased sales of existing products and services

(3.6.1.4) Value chain stage where the opportunity occurs

Select from:

☑ Downstream value chain

(3.6.1.5) Country/area where the opportunity occurs

Select all that apply

☑ United States of America

(3.6.1.8) Organization specific description

Grainger's ability to provide a robust offering of sustainability solutions - products, services, and resources - is critical to meeting our customers sustainability needs. Customers are facing a variety of environmental sustainability / climate-related challenges and are setting measurable goals to meet those challenges. The increased focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, managing waste, lowering water consumption, and improving air quality has led to an increased demand for products and services that help customers meet their sustainability related purchasing decisions. Grainger offers a broad assortment of environmentally preferable and other sustainability related products to help customers select products that feature environmental attributes either certified by an independent certification body or validated by the product supplier(s) or products that do not feature an environmental attribute but do help customers meet their sustainability initiatives. In 2023, Grainger High-Touch Solutions U.S. environmentally preferable products, other sustainability related products, and third-party sustainability services sales reached more than 2B. There is also a potential increased demand for Grainger's emergency management programs as part of climate change adaptation due to increased severe weather scenarios.

(3.6.1.9) Primary financial effect of the opportunity

Select from:

☑ Increased revenues resulting from increased demand for products and services

(3.6.1.10) Time horizon over which the opportunity is anticipated to have a substantive effect on the organization

Select all that apply

☑ The opportunity has already had a substantive effect on our organization in the reporting year

(3.6.1.12) Magnitude

Select from:

☑ High

(3.6.1.13) Effect of the opportunity on the financial position, financial performance and cash flows of the organization in the reporting period

Grainger's customers face a variety of environmental sustainability challenges, ranging from reducing greenhouse gas emissions to managing waste, lowering water consumption and improving air quality. Our customers are setting measurable goals to meet these challenges and minimize the impact their operations have on the environment. Meeting these goals is challenging and knowing who to turn to for help is not always clear. Grainger has been able support customers in achieving their goals through environmentally preferable products, other sustainability-related products, and third party sustainability services. In 2023, Grainger U.S. High-Touch Solutions sales related to our sustainability offering (e.g., environmentally preferable products, other sustainability-related products, and third-party sustainability services) reached more than 2B.

(3.6.1.15) Are you able to quantify the financial effects of the opportunity?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(3.6.1.16) Financial effect figure in the reporting year (currency)

2000000000

(3.6.1.23) Explanation of financial effect figures

The financial effect figure disclosed represents the dollar amount in revenue that result from our sustainability solutions offering, which includes environmentally preferable products, other sustainability related products, and third-party provided sustainability services.

(3.6.1.24) Cost to realize opportunity

239000

(3.6.1.25) Explanation of cost calculation

As demand for sustainability related products and services increases, Grainger continues to evaluate our portfolio to not only meet customer needs, but also to ensure compliance with current and anticipated standards. Voice-of customer reviews and product compliance governance are critical. Our Customer Strategy, Services, Merchandising and Supplier Management Teams continue to work together to ensure an evolving assortment of products and services that best meet customers needs are easily accessible on grainger.com. From a governance standpoint, quarterly, Grainger's Global Product Compliance and Supplier Stewardship team conducts a third-party review of our environmentally preferable (certification and attribute based) and other sustainability related products. The approximate cost for this consultive third-party review is 239,000.

(3.6.1.26) Strategy to realize opportunity

Grainger's strategy in this area includes focusing on voice of the customer so that we understand their needs related to climate and sustainability, and where Grainger is best positioned to support customers in these needs. As previously mentioned, Grainger continues to evaluate our portfolio to not only meet customer needs, but also to ensure compliance with current and anticipated standards. Our Customer Strategy, Services, Merchandising and Supplier Management Teams continue to work together to ensure an evolving assortment of products and services that best meet customers needs are easily accessible on grainger.com. Additionally, we have developed training, sales tools, and marketing support for our customer-facing team members so that they can help customers achieve meaningful progress towards their sustainability goals and initiatives.
[Add row]

(3.6.2) Provide the amount and proportion of your financial metrics in the reporting year that are aligned with the substantive effects of environmental opportunities.

Climate change

(3.6.2.1) Financial metric

Select from:
☑ Revenue

(3.6.2.2) Amount of financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue (unit currency as selected in 1.2)

2000000000

(3.6.2.3) % of total financial metric aligned with opportunities for this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ 11-20%

(3.6.2.4) Explanation of financial figures

As mentioned in 3.6.1, Grainger U.S. High-Touch Solutions sales related to our sustainability offering (e.g., environmentally preferable products, other sustainability-related products, and third-party sustainability services) reached more than 2B in 2023.
[Add row]

C4. Governance

(4.1) Does your organization have a board of directors or an equivalent governing body?

(4.1.1) Board of directors or equivalent governing body

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.1.2) Frequency with which the board or equivalent meets

Select from:

☑ Quarterly

(4.1.3) Types of directors your board or equivalent is comprised of

Select all that apply

☑ Executive directors or equivalent

☑ Independent non-executive directors or equivalent

(4.1.4) Board diversity and inclusion policy

Select from:

☑ Yes, and it is publicly available

(4.1.5) Briefly describe what the policy covers

In addition to stating the desired relevant business experience, qualifications, attributes and skills for Directors, the Criteria also enumerate personal characteristics that should be considered, including reputation for ethics and integrity, sound judgment, independent and objective thought, and respect for diverse opinions. Regarding diversity, the Criteria specify that consideration will be given to candidates without regard to race, color, religion, gender or national origin. To ensure that the Board benefits from diverse perspectives, it seeks qualified nominees from a variety of backgrounds, including gender, age, and racial and/or ethnic diversity. In any retained search for Board candidates, the Board interviews slates that include both gender and racially/ethnically diverse candidates. This practice was codified as a Board practice in the Criteria in 2019.

(4.1.6) Attach the policy (optional)

2024-proxy-statement.pdf,criteria-for-membership-december-2023.pdf
[Fixed row]

(4.1.1) Is there board-level oversight of environmental issues within your organization?

	Board-level oversight of this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.1.2) Identify the positions (do not include any names) of the individuals or committees on the board with accountability for environmental issues and provide details of the board's oversight of environmental issues.

Climate change

(4.1.2.1) Positions of individuals or committees with accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply
☑ Board-level committee

(4.1.2.2) Positions' accountability for this environmental issue is outlined in policies applicable to the board

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.1.2.3) Policies which outline the positions' accountability for this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Other policy applicable to the board, please specify **:**Committee Charter

(4.1.2.4) Frequency with which this environmental issue is a scheduled agenda item

Select from:

☑ Scheduled agenda item in some board meetings – at least annually

(4.1.2.5) Governance mechanisms into which this environmental issue is integrated

Select all that apply

☑ Reviewing and guiding annual budgets

☑ Overseeing the setting of corporate targets

☑ Monitoring progress towards corporate targets

☑ Approving and/or overseeing employee incentives

☑ Overseeing and guiding major capital expenditures

☑ Monitoring the implementation of the business strategy

☑ Overseeing reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Overseeing and guiding the development of a business strategy

☑ Overseeing and guiding acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures

☑ Reviewing and guiding the assessment process for dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

(4.1.2.7) Please explain

Grainger integrates ESG initiatives into its strategy and daily operations at every level of its business. This begins with general ESG oversight by the Board Affairs and Nominating Committee (BANC), which comprises all independent Directors. The Board recognizes the importance of ensuring that our strategy creates sustainable long-term value for Grainger's shareholders and other stakeholders. The Board includes Directors with particular expertise in corporate sustainability and environmental matters. At least annually, the BANC comprehensively reviews Grainger's ESG strategy, programs and reporting, including environmental sustainability and climate-related topics with senior management. In 2023, Grainger's Board of Directors approved an updated 2030 emissions target that seeks to reduce global absolute Scope 1 & Scope 2 emissions by 50% from a 2018 baseline by 2030, which is an increase from our previous 2030 target of 30%. Additionally, climate-related topics including details on Grainger's emissions reduction initiatives, such as solar investments, conversion of powered industrial equipment from lead-acid batteries to green hydrogen fuel cells and Grainger's scope 3 strategy were presented to the BANC in 2023. In addition to the BANC's annual review of ESG strategy, the BANC, Compensation Committee, and Audit Committee receive routine reports and updates on ESG and climate-related matters as needed. For example, the Board regularly receives updates on Grainger's emissions reduction performance throughout the year via an enterprise-wide scorecard, allowing progress monitoring on our emission reduction target. The BANC Committee Charter specifically assigns ERM reviews of the Company's ESG programs and

reporting, which would include climate-related risk, to the BANC. The Compensation Committee oversaw the recent integration of an ESG modifier within the executive leadership team's annual compensation program. Additionally, the Board's Audit Committee receives updates on climate-related regulation and climate/ESG reporting topics. As part of its practice since 2017, the Company also proactively made the Board's Lead Director available to investors in 2023 to explain and discuss Grainger's ESG and executive compensation practices and policies.
[Fixed row]

(4.2) Does your organization’s board have competency on environmental issues?

Climate change

(4.2.1) Board-level competency on this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.2.2) Mechanisms to maintain an environmentally competent board

Select all that apply
☑ Integrating knowledge of environmental issues into board nominating process
☑ Having at least one board member with expertise on this environmental issue

(4.2.3) Environmental expertise of the board member

Experience
☑ Executive-level experience in a role focused on environmental issues

[Fixed row]

(4.3) Is there management-level responsibility for environmental issues within your organization?

	Management-level responsibility for this environmental issue
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.3.1) Provide the highest senior management-level positions or committees with responsibility for environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change

(4.3.1.1) Position of individual or committee with responsibility

Executive level

☑ Chief Executive Officer (CEO)

(4.3.1.2) Environmental responsibilities of this position

Dependencies, impacts, risks and opportunities

☑ Assessing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Assessing future trends in environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

☑ Managing environmental dependencies, impacts, risks, and opportunities

Engagement

☑ Managing value chain engagement related to environmental issues

Policies, commitments, and targets

☑ Measuring progress towards environmental corporate targets

☑ Setting corporate environmental targets

Strategy and financial planning

☑ Implementing the business strategy related to environmental issues

☑ Developing a business strategy which considers environmental issues

☑ Managing environmental reporting, audit, and verification processes

☑ Managing acquisitions, mergers, and divestitures related to environmental issues

☑ Managing major capital and/or operational expenditures relating to environmental issues

☑ Managing priorities related to innovation/low-environmental impact products or services (including R&D)

(4.3.1.4) Reporting line

Select from:

☑ Reports to the board directly

(4.3.1.5) Frequency of reporting to the board on environmental issues

Select from:

☑ Annually

(4.3.1.6) Please explain

Grainger's ESG Leadership Council is comprised of the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), as well as the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer (CFO), Senior Vice President and Chief Legal Officer, Senior Vice President and President of Grainger Business Unit, Senior Vice President and Chief Human Resources Officer (CHRO), Senior Vice President of Merchandising and Supplier Management, Senior Vice President and Chief Technology Officer, Senior Vice President and Chief Product Officer, Senior Vice President of Branch and DC Operations, Group Vice President of Supply Chain, and Group Vice President of Customer Experience. Climate-related responsibilities listed in our response are assigned to the Chairman and CEO because that role leads the company's ESG efforts and chairs the ESG Leadership Council. The ESG Leadership Council is updated or meets at least quarterly to discuss pertinent ESG issues and objectives, which include climate-related issues. During ESG Leadership Council meetings and communications, the CEO regularly receive updates on Grainger's climate-related issues, provides strategic direction on climate-related issues, oversees and approves our climate-related corporate targets, receives performance updates on progress against climate-related corporate targets, provides direction on the management of value chain engagement on climate-related issues, and assesses and manages climate-related risks and opportunities that are routinely brought forth in the ESG Leadership Council meetings. The CEO and ESG Leadership Council are supported by cross-functional ESG Working Groups comprised of subject matter experts focused on near-term and material ESG priorities and topics, including two Working Groups specifically aimed at Scope 1 & 2 emissions and Scope 3 emissions, respectively.

[Add row]

(4.5) Do you provide monetary incentives for the management of environmental issues, including the attainment of targets?

Climate change

(4.5.1) Provision of monetary incentives related to this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.5.2) % of total C-suite and board-level monetary incentives linked to the management of this environmental issue

0

(4.5.3) Please explain

Grainger U.S.-based executive leadership team's annual short term incentive metrics focus on sustaining profitable growth. Payouts are based on 50% total Company daily, organic constant currency sales and 50% total Company adjusted ROIC performance as well as on an ESG modifier, which can increase or decrease payouts determined by financial performance up to /- 10 percentage points. The ESG modifier is comprised of two quantitative metrics: total absolute Scope 1 & Scope 2 emissions and diverse leadership representation. In 2023, both ESG modifier metrics were within targeted range. Therefore, the ESG modifier was determined to be 0%, and the final MIP payment remained unchanged based on daily, organic constant currency sales and adjusted ROIC. The Board of Directors do not have climate-related goals incorporated into their monetary incentives.
[Fixed row]

(4.5.1) Provide further details on the monetary incentives provided for the management of environmental issues (do not include the names of individuals).

Climate change

(4.5.1.1) Position entitled to monetary incentive

Board or executive level

☑ Corporate executive team

(4.5.1.2) Incentives

Select all that apply

☑ Bonus - % of salary

(4.5.1.3) Performance metrics

Emission reduction

☑ Reduction in absolute emissions

(4.5.1.4) Incentive plan the incentives are linked to

Select from:

☑ Short-Term Incentive Plan, or equivalent, only (e.g. contractual annual bonus)

(4.5.1.5) Further details of incentives

Grainger U.S.-based executive leadership team's annual short term incentive metrics focus on sustaining profitable growth. Payouts are based on 50% total Company daily, organic constant currency sales and 50% total Company adjusted ROIC performance as well as on an ESG modifier, which can increase or decrease payouts determined by financial performance up to /- 10 percentage points. The ESG modifier is comprised of two quantitative metrics: total absolute Scope 1 & Scope 2 emissions and diverse leadership representation.

(4.5.1.6) How the position's incentives contribute to the achievement of your environmental commitments and/or climate transition plan

The climate-related quantitative metric included in the annual executive incentive program, total absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions, is directly related to Grainger's public climate-related target to reduce total absolute Scope 1 and 2 emissions 50% by 2030 from a 2018 baseline. Therefore, our annual executive compensation program aligns with Grainger's public targets and efforts to reduce emissions and minimize our climate-related impact.
[Add row]

(4.6) Does your organization have an environmental policy that addresses environmental issues?

	Does your organization have any environmental policies?
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(4.10) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

(4.10.1) Are you a signatory or member of any environmental collaborative frameworks or initiatives?

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.10.2) Collaborative framework or initiative

Select all that apply

☑ Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD)

☑ Other, please specify **:**U.S. Green Business Council for LEED and TRUE Zero Waste certifications. Additionally, we annually participate in the CDP as a CDP supporter.

(4.10.3) Describe your organization’s role within each framework or initiative

Grainger annually discloses in alignment with the Task Force on Climate-related Financial Disclosures (TCFD) recommendations. Additionally, we have buildings that are LEED-certified through the U.S. Green Building Council (USGBC). We also have 3 distribution centers that are TRUE Zero Waste certified through USGBC, and plan to continue to certify other distribution centers.
[Fixed row]

(4.11) In the reporting year, did your organization engage in activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment?

(4.11.1) External engagement activities that could directly or indirectly influence policy, law, or regulation that may impact the environment

Select all that apply

☑ Yes, we engaged indirectly through, and/or provided financial or in-kind support to a trade association or other intermediary organization or individual whose activities could influence policy, law, or regulation

(4.11.2) Indicate whether your organization has a public commitment or position statement to conduct your engagement activities in line with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not plan to have one in the next two years

(4.11.5) Indicate whether your organization is registered on a transparency register

Select from:

☑ Yes

(4.11.6) Types of transparency register your organization is registered on

Select all that apply

☑ Mandatory government register

(4.11.7) Disclose the transparency registers on which your organization is registered & the relevant ID numbers for your organization

US House and Senate Lobby Disclosure Act Reports; ID numbers- NA

(4.11.8) Describe the process your organization has in place to ensure that your external engagement activities are consistent with your environmental commitments and/or transition plan

Grainger's Business Conduct Guidelines prohibit the use of company funds or assets for political purposes, including for contributions to any political party, candidate or committee. Grainger does not maintain a political action committee. Given a particular issue, it is prudent for Grainger to understand the legislative and regulatory environments at both the federal and state levels. Grainger has, from time-to-time, engaged advisors to assist in limited lobbying, mainly related to government procurement. In 2023, Grainger was a member of five trade associations. As such, Grainger may engage indirectly in activities that could influence policy, law, or regulation that impacts the climate through membership in trade associations. Grainger has not assessed in detail whether or not the trade associations in which we are a member are consistent with our own internal climate strategy and commitments.
[Fixed row]

(4.11.2) Provide details of your indirect engagement on policy, law, or regulation that may (positively or negatively) impact the environment through trade associations or other intermediary organizations or individuals in the reporting year.

Row 1

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:
☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America
☑ US Chamber of Commerce

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:
☑ Unknown

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

50000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

The funding provided was in the form of membership fees. This trade association may influence policy, law or regulation related to climate on behalf of its members.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ No, we have not evaluated

Row 2

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify **:**National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

96000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

The funding provided was in the form of membership fees. This trade association may influence policy, law or regulation related to climate on behalf of its members.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ No, we have not evaluated

Row 3

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify :Health Industry Distributors Association

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

27000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

The funding provided was in the form of membership fees. This trade association may influence policy, law or regulation related to climate on behalf of its members.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ No, we have not evaluated

Row 4

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify **:**Power Transmission Distributors Association

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

3000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

The funding provided was in the form of membership fees. This trade association may influence policy, law or regulation related to climate on behalf of its members.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ No, we have not evaluated

Row 5

(4.11.2.1) Type of indirect engagement

Select from:

☑ Indirect engagement via a trade association

(4.11.2.4) Trade association

North America

☑ Other trade association in North America, please specify :Coalition for Government Procurement

(4.11.2.5) Environmental issues relevant to the policies, laws, or regulations on which the organization or individual has taken a position

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.11.2.6) Indicate whether your organization's position is consistent with the organization or individual you engage with

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(4.11.2.7) Indicate whether your organization attempted to influence the organization or individual's position in the reporting year

Select from:

☑ No, we did not attempt to influence their position

(4.11.2.9) Funding figure your organization provided to this organization or individual in the reporting year (currency)

71000

(4.11.2.10) Describe the aim of this funding and how it could influence policy, law or regulation that may impact the environment

The funding provided was in the form of membership fees. This trade association may influence policy, law or regulation related to climate on behalf of its members.

(4.11.2.11) Indicate if you have evaluated whether your organization's engagement is aligned with global environmental treaties or policy goals

Select from:

☑ No, we have not evaluated

[Add row]

(4.12) Have you published information about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(4.12.1) Provide details on the information published about your organization's response to environmental issues for this reporting year in places other than your CDP response. Please attach the publication.

Row 1

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:
☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Risks & Opportunities
☑ Emission targets

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Page v - emissions targets; page 21 - climate risks

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

grainger-2023-ar10k.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

2023 Annual Report

Row 2

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:
☑ In mainstream reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply
☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:
☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply
☑ Governance
☑ Strategy
☑ Emission targets

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Pages 24-28

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2024-proxy-statement (1).pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

2024 Proxy Statement

Row 3

(4.12.1.1) Publication

Select from:

☑ In voluntary sustainability reports

(4.12.1.3) Environmental issues covered in publication

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(4.12.1.4) Status of the publication

Select from:

☑ Complete

(4.12.1.5) Content elements

Select all that apply

☑ Governance

☑ Risks & Opportunities

☑ Strategy

☑ Emissions figures

☑ Emission targets

(4.12.1.6) Page/section reference

Pages 6, 18-19, 22-23, 32, 35-40, 52-54

(4.12.1.7) Attach the relevant publication

2024 Grainger ESG Report.pdf

(4.12.1.8) Comment

2024 ESG Report
[Add row]

C5. Business strategy

(5.1) Does your organization use scenario analysis to identify environmental outcomes?

Climate change

(5.1.1) Use of scenario analysis

Select from:
☑ Yes

(5.1.2) Frequency of analysis

Select from:
☑ Annually
[Fixed row]

(5.1.1) Provide details of the scenarios used in your organization's scenario analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Physical climate scenarios
☑ RCP 8.5

(5.1.1.2) Scenario used SSPs used in conjunction with scenario

Select from:
☑ SSP5

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative and quantitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Acute physical

☑ Chronic physical

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 4.0°C and above

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2018

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

☑ 2060

☑ 2070

☑ 2080

☑ 2090

☑ 2100

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Local ecosystem asset interactions, dependencies and impacts

☑ Climate change (one of five drivers of nature change)

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

Macro and microeconomy

☑ Domestic growth

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

In Grainger's scenario analysis work, we are using the assumptions and narrative outlined in SSP5-8.5. RCP 8.5 depicts a "high business as usual" pathway with high levels emissions due to slow improvements in energy efficiency. The scenario includes assumptions of low income, high population and high energy demand, in which baseline carbon dioxide emissions are even higher than current trends. Additionally, the shared socioeconomic pathway (SSP5) corresponding with our scenario analysis includes a narrative in which the "world places increasing faith in competitive markets, innovation and participatory societies to produce rapid technological progress and development of human capital as the path to sustainable development. Global markets are increasingly integrated. There are also strong investments in health, education, and institutions to enhance human and social capital. At the same time, the push for economic and social development is coupled with the exploitation of abundant fossil fuel resources and the adoption of resource and energy intensive lifestyles around the world. All these factors lead to rapid growth of the global economy, while global population peaks and declines in the 21st century. Local environmental problems like air pollution are successfully managed. There is faith in the ability to effectively manage social and ecological systems, including by geo-engineering if necessary" taken directly from Riahi et al. (2017). This scenario is only possible under a certain set of assumptions and is unlikely to unfold exactly as described. However, Grainger wanted to understand potential exposure to risk under more extreme future situations as opposed to optimistic future pathways / scenarios.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Grainger has selected RCP 8.5 to understand the key physical risks, as well as business opportunities, that Grainger may face in a future scenario with high-levels of temperature rise, expected high-frequency of extreme weather, chronic conditions such as high heat and drought, and high-levels of adaptation needed (e.g., high levels of expected physical risk)

Climate change

(5.1.1.1) Scenario used

Climate transition scenarios

☑ Customized publicly available climate transition scenario, please specify

(5.1.1.3) Approach to scenario

Select from:

☑ Qualitative

(5.1.1.4) Scenario coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.1.5) Risk types considered in scenario

Select all that apply

☑ Policy

☑ Market

☑ Reputation

☑ Technology

☑ Liability

(5.1.1.6) Temperature alignment of scenario

Select from:

☑ 1.5°C or lower

(5.1.1.7) Reference year

2014

(5.1.1.8) Timeframes covered

Select all that apply

☑ 2025

☑ 2030

☑ 2040

☑ 2050

☑ 2060

(5.1.1.9) Driving forces in scenario

Stakeholder and customer demands

☑ Consumer sentiment

☑ Consumer attention to impact

Regulators, legal and policy regimes

☑ Global regulation

☑ Level of action (from local to global)

☑ Global targets

(5.1.1.10) Assumptions, uncertainties and constraints in scenario

Grainger has used a customized publicly available climate transition scenario IEA B2DS to quantify the emissions reduction required to align with a well-below 2.0C and 1.5C emissions reduction trajectory, respectively. Achieving the 2C scenario (2DS) requires a 40% reduction in cumulative CO2 emissions by 2060 compared to the Reference Technology Scenario (RTS), a baseline scenario that takes into account existing energy and climate-related commitments by countries, including Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) pledged under the Paris Agreement. This necessitates efforts beyond current policies, trends, and NDC commitments. According to the IEA, the power sector must be nearly decarbonized by 2060, with 98% of generation from low-carbon sources, phasing out unabated coal by the 2040s and equipping 60% of gas-fired plants with carbon capture and storage (CCS) technology. Emissions from buildings must decrease by 85%, and the share of EVs or FCEVs in light-duty vehicles should reach 60% and in heavy-duty vehicles 40% by 2060. In industry, 19% of the reductions needed will rely on emerging technologies not yet commercially available, including significant CCS penetration. Achieving even more ambitious climate goals, such as the well-below 2C pathway, would be increasingly challenging and costly. The B2DS scenario illustrates this, requiring almost a 60% reduction in cumulative emissions by 2060 compared to the RTS. To bridge the gap to the 2DS, a profoundly accelerated and intensified policy response is necessary, increasing ambition across multiple areas simultaneously: carbon pricing, efficiency standards, regulatory frameworks, targeted technology measures, and innovative solutions. All energy sectors and technology options must support steep global emissions reductions. Moving beyond 2C demands in the B2DS would require even greater policy momentum and ambition. In this scenario,

Grainger assumes the countries in which we operate would all be partaking in policy and actions that align with such pathways, but in practice there will likely be different levels of ambition across countries, which may significantly impact our transition risk.

(5.1.1.11) Rationale for choice of scenario

Grainger has used a customized publicly available climate transition scenario IEA B2DS to quantify the emissions reduction required to align with a well-below 2.0C and 1.5C emissions reduction trajectory, respectively. The rationale for this scenario was to understand our transition risks in a future scenario in which rapid decarbonization occurs and is driven by international policy goals.
[Add row]

(5.1.2) Provide details of the outcomes of your organization's scenario analysis.

Climate change

(5.1.2.1) Business processes influenced by your analysis of the reported scenarios

Select all that apply

☑ Risk and opportunities identification, assessment and management

☑ Strategy and financial planning

☑ Target setting and transition planning

(5.1.2.2) Coverage of analysis

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(5.1.2.3) Summarize the outcomes of the scenario analysis and any implications for other environmental issues

For a customized version of climate scenario IEA B2DS in which we evaluate 2C and 1.5C temperature alignment, the results of the analysis show that Grainger would be required to reduce total absolute global scope 1 & 2 emissions by 30% to align to a well-below 2.0C emission reduction trajectory, 50% to align with a 1.5C emission reduction trajectory and reduce scope 3 by 2.5% on an annual linear basis (30% over 10 years), covering at least 67% of total scope 3 emissions. This informed our decision to evaluate accredited Science Based Targets alignment, as well as the business and carbon reduction strategies necessary to achieve such targets. While Grainger ultimately decided not to pursue targets validated by the Science-Based Target initiative, we did set a new emissions reduction target that aims to reduce total absolute Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by 50% from a 2018 baseline by 2030, which is up from our previous 30% target. This new target also aligns with a 1.5 degree Celsius pathway for Scope 1 and Scope 2 based on Science-Based Target initiative's guidelines. Grainger has taken strategic steps toward

benchmarking our buildings' operations against industry standard to ensure we are investing in the most impactful initiatives to reduce our total carbon emissions (facility lighting retrofits, and HVAC equipment heat load studies to right-size our building loads). For scope 3 emissions, Grainger is actively pursuing improvement through engagement with our suppliers and customers to collectively progress on sustainability and emission goals. One case study from Grainger's analysis was evaluating the impact of solar panel system generating electricity in our network. With three systems in place at two sites, Grainger investigated the effects of installing more systems. Grainger found that not only do more solar panels offer the primary environmental and economic benefits, but there are secondary benefits as well. This includes increased energy independence from the energy grid, and that in turn improves Grainger's business continuity by minimizing the impact of utility grid disruptions. For RCP 8.5, Grainger assessed the material acute and chronic physical risks that could result in a future world where temperature has risen significantly, potentially beyond 4C. Specifically, Grainger looked at the likelihood and severity of expected extreme weather events that would impact our assets and supply chain, and as a result, could cause business interruption, decreased revenues, increased operating costs and capital expenditures. Grainger was able to identify assets and regions in its supply chain that are expected to be the most vulnerable. Additionally, Grainger found that operational costs are likely to increase as a result of higher temperatures (3.7C increase) and the need to implement certain protocols and measures such as increased air conditioning requirements, installing more large overhead fans, team member training, and cold water fill stations for its team members. Initial findings from scenario analysis prompted Grainger to explore and pursue additional scenario analysis support from a third-party vendor using rigorous climate and earth modeling to deep-dive into potential physical risks in which our operations may be exposed under multiple different scenarios.
[Fixed row]

(5.2) Does your organization's strategy include a climate transition plan?

(5.2.1) Transition plan

Select from:

☑ No and we do not plan to develop a climate transition plan within the next two years

(5.2.15) Primary reason for not having a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

Select from:

☑ Not an immediate strategic priority

(5.2.16) Explain why your organization does not have a climate transition plan that aligns with a 1.5°C world

In 2023, Grainger's Board of Directors approved an updated 2030 emissions target that seeks to reduce global absolute Scope 1 & Scope 2 emissions by 50% from a 2018 baseline by 2030, which is an increase from our previous 2030 target of 30%. This new goal aligns Scope 1 & Scope 2 emissions reduction with the level required to limit global temperature rise to 1.5 degrees Celsius according to the Science-Based Target initiative's guidelines. However, our target is not validated by the Science-Based Target initiative, as it does not include Scope 3. We recognize the importance of reducing Scope 3 emissions as part of mitigating climate risks and our environmental impact. Grainger's ESG Leadership Council regularly reviews our overall carbon emissions reduction strategy. Scope 3 considers all indirect

emissions (not included in Scopes 1 & 2) that occur upstream and downstream from Grainger's operations, and for Grainger, the majority of Scope 3 impact resides in the product-use phase, or the energy required to operate the products we sell. At this time, Grainger is focused on reducing the emissions within our direct control, so we have decided not to pursue Scope 3 emissions targets or Science-Based targets. Because of this, according to Science-Based Targets initiative and CDP's definition of transition plans, we cannot claim to have a climate transition plan which aligns with a 1.5 degrees Celsius world.
[Fixed row]

(5.3) Have environmental risks and opportunities affected your strategy and/or financial planning?

(5.3.1) Environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy and/or financial planning

Select from:
☑ Yes, both strategy and financial planning

(5.3.2) Business areas where environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy

Select all that apply
☑ Products and services
☑ Investment in R&D
☑ Operations
[Fixed row]

(5.3.1) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your strategy.

Products and services

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply
☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Grainger's ability to provide a robust offering of sustainability solutions - products, services, and resources - is critical to meeting our customers sustainability needs. Customers are facing a variety of environmental sustainability / climate-related challenges and are setting measurable goals to meet those challenges. The increased focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, managing waste, lowering water consumption, and improving air quality has led to an increased demand for products and services that help customers meet their sustainability related purchasing decisions. Grainger offers a broad assortment of environmentally preferable and other sustainability related products to help customers select products that feature environmental attributes either certified by an independent certification body or validated by the product supplier(s) or products that do not feature an environmental attribute but do help customers meet their sustainability initiatives. In 2023, Grainger High-Touch Solutions U.S. environmentally preferable products, other sustainability related products, and third-party sustainability services sales reached more than 2B. There is also a potential increased demand for Grainger's emergency management programs as part of climate change adaptation due to increased severe weather scenarios.

Investment in R&D

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Grainger continues to make climate-related R&D investments. For example, Grainger conducts benchmarking and explores new climate-related opportunities across our network. Over the past few years, we conducted lighting audits across our supply chain and corporate network. We discovered commonalities among energy loads, batteries, HVAC systems, lighting, conveyor systems and air compressors, to name a few. All of these areas offered strategic opportunities for long-term efficiency gains as we implemented energy reduction projects from the findings of these audits. Additionally, we found it to be very effective to invest in comprehensive building management systems in key locations with great return on investment timeframes. By monitoring our buildings via these systems, we are able to identify and trend global warming risks as they occur and adjust our investment and operation strategies accordingly.

Operations

(5.3.1.1) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

(5.3.1.2) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected your strategy in this area

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.3.1.3) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected your strategy in this area

Inability to provide customers the products they want when they want them could significantly impact our results. Grainger's ability to provide same-day shipping and next-day delivery is an integral component of Grainger's business strategy and any such disruption could adversely impact results of operations and financial performance. Examples include severe or catastrophic events such as wildfires, floods, and hurricanes related to climate change. Due to this risk, Grainger conducts Business Impact Analyses to analyze risks and quantify major exposures to Grainger distribution centers within its supply chain, with the particular goal of quantifying the risk of a large-scale DC outage. It is typically updated on a three- to four-year cycle. The latest Business Impact Analysis occurred in 2023. This analysis is reflective of our key in-scope distribution centers in the United States. The outcomes include prioritization of key facilities or processes by quantifying the impact of exposures facing the organization against specific physical risks. Specifically, identified high-risk DCs as it relates to severe weather and climate change for Grainger currently include Patterson, CA, Mira Loma, CA, and Jacksonville, FL, as the state of California is more prone to prolonged droughts and extensive wildfires while the Jacksonville location is exposed to hurricane / tropical storm damage that can impact Grainger's ability to do business. There have been no serious outages across the DC network during periods of extreme weather over the past few years which include: Hurricane Ida in the Southeast, the Dixie Fire in California, the Winter Storm Uri in Texas, and Hurricane Ian in Florida. However, wildfires in CA have caused air quality issues in a California DC in the past.
[Add row]

(5.3.2) Describe where and how environmental risks and opportunities have affected your financial planning.

Row 1

(5.3.2.1) Financial planning elements that have been affected

Select all that apply

☑ Revenues

☑ Capital expenditures

(5.3.2.2) Effect type

Select all that apply

☑ Risks

☑ Opportunities

(5.3.2.3) Environmental issues relevant to the risks and/or opportunities that have affected these financial planning elements

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(5.3.2.4) Describe how environmental risks and/or opportunities have affected these financial planning elements

Capital Expenditures: Grainger has now set up a separate capital budget entirely for climate-related initiatives in an effort to ensure consistent capital allocation and progress in this important space. Currently, our main investments include solar installations, building management systems (BMS), high efficiency life cycle replacements (upgrade lighting to occupancy sensor equipped LED fixtures; upgrade HVAC units with energy efficient equipment), and hydrogen fuel cell batteries for our Powered Industrial Equipment (PIE). Our decisions to invest often occur in locations where we can offset energy use, improve operational efficiency, and create a return on investment. Revenue: Grainger's ability to provide a robust offering of sustainability solutions - products, services, and resources - is critical to meeting our customers sustainability needs. Customers are facing a variety of environmental sustainability / climate-related challenges and are setting measurable goals to meet those challenges. The increased focus on reducing greenhouse gas emissions, managing waste, lowering water consumption, and improving air quality has led to an increased demand for products and services that help customers meet their sustainability related purchasing decisions. In 2023, Grainger High-Touch Solutions U.S. environmentally preferable products, other sustainability related products, and third-party sustainability services sales reached more than 2B. There is also a potential increased demand for Grainger's emergency management programs as part of climate change adaptation due to increased severe weather scenarios. Additionally, there is potential for increased demand for our products and emergency management programs as part of adaptation to climate change, including increased weather severity that results in more emergencies. Related to this, Grainger has started tracking the financial impact of extreme weather events on our business in terms of expenditures expensed as incurred and capitalized costs and charges.
[Add row]

(5.4) In your organization's financial accounting, do you identify spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition?

	Identification of spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment with your organization's climate transition
	Select from: ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Other methodology or framework

[Fixed row]

(5.4.1) Quantify the amount and percentage share of your spending/revenue that is aligned with your organization's climate transition.

	Methodology or framework used to assess alignment	Financial metric
Row 1	*Select from:* ☑ Other, please specify :Internal methodology used to classify CapEX spend on transition activities	*Select from:* ☑ CAPEX

[Add row]

(5.10) Does your organization use an internal price on environmental externalities?

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities	Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities
	Select from:	*Select from:*	*n/a*

	Use of internal pricing of environmental externalities	Primary reason for not pricing environmental externalities	Explain why your organization does not price environmental externalities
	☑ No, and we do not plan to in the next two years	☑ No standardized procedure	

[Fixed row]

(5.11) Do you engage with your value chain on environmental issues?

	Engaging with this stakeholder on environmental issues	Environmental issues covered
Suppliers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change
Customers	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change
Investors and shareholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change
Other value chain stakeholders	*Select from:* ☑ Yes	*Select all that apply* ☑ Climate change

[Fixed row]

(5.11.1) Does your organization assess and classify suppliers according to their dependencies and/or impacts on the environment?

	Assessment of supplier dependencies and/or impacts on the environment
Climate change	*Select from:* ☑ No, we do not currently assess the dependencies and/or impacts of our suppliers, but we plan to do so within the next two years

[Fixed row]

(5.11.2) Does your organization prioritize which suppliers to engage with on environmental issues?

Climate change

(5.11.2.1) Supplier engagement prioritization on this environmental issue

Select from:

☑ Yes, we prioritize which suppliers to engage with on this environmental issue

(5.11.2.2) Criteria informing which suppliers are prioritized for engagement on this environmental issue

Select all that apply

☑ Procurement spend

☑ Strategic status of suppliers

(5.11.2.4) Please explain

Grainger prioritizes which suppliers to partner with on Environmental issues based on spend.
[Fixed row]

(5.11.5) Do your suppliers have to meet environmental requirements as part of your organization’s purchasing process?

Climate change

(5.11.5.1) Suppliers have to meet specific environmental requirements related to this environmental issue as part of the purchasing process

Select from:

☑ Yes, environmental requirements related to this environmental issue are included in our supplier contracts

(5.11.5.2) Policy in place for addressing supplier non-compliance

Select from:

☑ Yes, we have a policy in place for addressing non-compliance

(5.11.5.3) Comment

Grainger suppliers are contractually obligated to comply with all regulatory requirements for the products they sell to us, and communicate all regulatory considerations impacting the sale of their products to us. Suppliers routinely provide regulatory and sustainability information to Grainger on the products we carry in our portfolio. Suppliers are contractually obligated to notify Grainger in advance of any regulatory changes impacting their products, and we additionally prompt all suppliers to review and update their regulatory information on an annual basis. Grainger verifies and stores this information upon receipt, and we utilize third party consulting services to validate any sustainability claims. Grainger also reinforces its commitment to regulatory and sustainability through requirements in our Supplier Code of Ethics as well as our Supplier Handbook.
[Fixed row]

(5.11.6) Provide details of the environmental requirements that suppliers have to meet as part of your organization's purchasing process, and the compliance measures in place.

Climate change

(5.11.6.1) Environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Regular environmental risk assessments (at least once annually)

(5.11.6.2) Mechanisms for monitoring compliance with this environmental requirement

Select all that apply

☑ Off-site third-party audit

☑ Supplier self-assessment

(5.11.6.3) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 100%

(5.11.6.4) % tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ 1-25%

(5.11.6.7) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers required to comply with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ None

(5.11.6.8) % tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions attributable to the suppliers in compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ None

(5.11.6.9) Response to supplier non-compliance with this environmental requirement

Select from:

☑ Retain and engage

(5.11.6.10) % of non-compliant suppliers engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.6.11) Procedures to engage non-compliant suppliers

Select all that apply

☑ Providing information on appropriate actions that can be taken to address non-compliance

(5.11.6.12) Comment

In the event a supplier does not comply with our environmental requirements, Grainger's Supplier Management Team will engage the supplier and develop a corrective action plan.
[Add row]

(5.11.7) Provide further details of your organization’s supplier engagement on environmental issues.

Climate change

(5.11.7.2) Action driven by supplier engagement

Select from:

☑ Emissions reduction

(5.11.7.3) Type and details of engagement

Financial incentives

☑ Feature environmental performance in supplier awards scheme

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Collaborate with suppliers on innovations to reduce environmental impacts in products and services

(5.11.7.4) Upstream value chain coverage

Select all that apply

☑ Tier 1 suppliers

(5.11.7.5) % of tier 1 suppliers by procurement spend covered by engagement

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(5.11.7.6) % of tier 1 supplier-related scope 3 emissions covered by engagement

Select from:
☑ Less than 1%

(5.11.7.9) Describe the engagement and explain the effect of your engagement on the selected environmental action

Grainger awards a Sustainable Partner of the Year Award on an annual basis. And include public commitments to GHG reductions as part of our criteria. In addition, Grainger conducted discussions with select strategic suppliers focusing on GHG emissions.

(5.11.7.10) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers meet an environmental requirement related to this environmental issue

Select from:
☑ No, this engagement is unrelated to meeting an environmental requirement

(5.11.7.11) Engagement is helping your tier 1 suppliers engage with their own suppliers on the selected action

Select from:
☑ Unknown
[Add row]

(5.11.9) Provide details of any environmental engagement activity with other stakeholders in the value chain.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Customers

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information about your products and relevant certification schemes

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

Innovation and collaboration

☑ Align your organization's goals to support customers' targets and ambitions

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

The Customer Strategy and Merchandising and Supplier Management teams at Grainger collaborate with various business units to support customers and their sustainability goals through our environmentally preferable and other sustainability related products portfolio. We engage with 100% of our customers in offering these products through our catalog and website (Grainger.com). This engagement also involves assessing customer feedback and market trends to determine the products to carry and how to present them on our website/catalog. Our merchants incorporate this feedback to ensure we offer suitable sustainable product options. We work with suppliers to gather relevant product information including applicable product declarations, review environmental attributes and third-party certifications, and present them in a way that helps customers choose products aligned with their sustainability goals. We have improved our data driven analytics to meet the demands of customers who are taking science-based climate action and seek energy efficient products with low-carbon certifications. Examples of certified low-carbon designations in products that we offer include Carbonfree, EnergyStar and DLC Approved. Our data driven analytics assist customers in monitoring, reporting, and increasing their sustainable spending. We also provide training, sales tools, and marketing support to our customer-facing team members, empowering them to help customers make progress towards their sustainability goals. The emissions associated with the product use phase are included in the % Scope 3 Emissions attributable to this group.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We routinely review our environmentally preferable and other sustainability related products portfolio for opportunities to provide tailored solutions to customers with sustainability related procurement goals. We look at the sales performance of the environmentally preferable products, other sustainability related products, and third-party provided sustainability services revenue as our measure of success in helping customers select the products that will help them meet their sustainability goals. Quantitatively, Grainger's measure of success for this portfolio is when our sales in our sustainability solutions offering increase compared to the prior year, as well as a growth rate that outperforms our total company revenue.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Investors and shareholders

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Education/Information sharing

☑ Share information on environmental initiatives, progress and achievements

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

Grainger engages with current and prospective shareholders on a variety of topics including our climate-related actions and performance. For those with a particular interest in our climate program, we will host calls in which we answer questions related to our overall program, strategy, and goals. Additionally, as part of our 2024

materiality assessment using a double-materiality-informed approach, we engaged with investors and other key stakeholders to identify the ESG and sustainability topics most critical to our business.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We do not currently disclose measures of success related to our investor and shareholder engagement on climate topics.

Climate change

(5.11.9.1) Type of stakeholder

Select from:

☑ Other value chain stakeholder, please specify **:**Community Partners and Team Members

(5.11.9.2) Type and details of engagement

Other

☑ Other, please specify **:**Materiality Assessment work

(5.11.9.3) % of stakeholder type engaged

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.4) % stakeholder-associated scope 3 emissions

Select from:

☑ Unknown

(5.11.9.5) Rationale for engaging these stakeholders and scope of engagement

As part of our 2024 materiality assessment using a double-materiality-informed approach, we engaged with key stakeholders such as our community partners and team members to identify the ESG and sustainability topics most critical to our business.

(5.11.9.6) Effect of engagement and measures of success

We do not currently disclose measures of success related to engagement with our community partners or team members on climate topics.
[Add row]

C6. Environmental Performance - Consolidation Approach

(6.1) Provide details on your chosen consolidation approach for the calculation of environmental performance data.

Climate change

(6.1.1) Consolidation approach used

Select from:

☑ Operational control

(6.1.2) Provide the rationale for the choice of consolidation approach

Grainger has determined that the most practical and meaningful method to consolidate its corporate emissions is based on Operational Control. Under this approach, Grainger has selected to account for 100% of those emissions at properties in its U.S. and international operations where the company has the full authority to introduce and implement operating policies at the property. This applies to all leased or "rental" space where Grainger maintains operating leases. The operational control approach best matches the company's current access to accurate and reliable data, as well as the ability to influence emission reduction programs. The subsidiaries that fall under the operational control of Grainger include Grainger U.S., Grainger Canada, Grainger Mexico, Cromwell, Zoro and MonotaRO.
[Fixed row]

C7. Environmental performance - Climate Change

(7.1) Is this your first year of reporting emissions data to CDP?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.1.1) Has your organization undergone any structural changes in the reporting year, or are any previous structural changes being accounted for in this disclosure of emissions data?

(7.1.1.1) Has there been a structural change?

Select all that apply
☑ Yes, a divestment

(7.1.1.2) Name of organization(s) acquired, divested from, or merged with

E&R Industrial Sales

(7.1.1.3) Details of structural change(s), including completion dates

In the fourth quarter of 2023, Grainger divested E & R Industrial Sales, Inc. (E&R) and recorded a one-time pre-tax loss on the divestiture of 26 million in SG&A. Grainger does not expect this business exit to have a material effect on the future results of operations.
[Fixed row]

(7.1.2) Has your emissions accounting methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition changed in the reporting year?

	Change(s) in methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition?	Details of methodology, boundary, and/or reporting year definition change(s)
	Select all that apply ☑ Yes, a change in boundary	*Base year adjusted from 2018 to 2023*

[Fixed row]

(7.1.3) Have your organization's base year emissions and past years' emissions been recalculated as a result of any changes or errors reported in 7.1.1 and/or 7.1.2?

(7.1.3.1) Base year recalculation

Select from:

☑ Yes

(7.1.3.2) Scope(s) recalculated

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 3

(7.1.3.3) Base year emissions recalculation policy, including significance threshold

In the regular course of business, Grainger may experience structural changes that may have a significant impact on the base year emissions. Consistent with the GHGP Corporate Standard (WRI/WBCSD 2004), significant changes that may trigger a base year recalculation include the following: • Structural changes to ownership or control (e.g., mergers, acquisitions, divestitures, and outsourcing and insourcing of emitting activities) •Changes in status of leased assets (ending leases or obtaining new leases). • Changes in calculation methodology or improvement in the accuracy of emission factors or activity data. • Discovery of significant errors. A recalculation of Grainger's base year emissions and all subsequent years' emissions will be performed if any structural change, as identified above, results in significant qualitative or quantitative impact. Grainger has a quantitative threshold for significance, related to the % change in base year Scope 1 and 2 emissions. In cases of organic growth (e.g., property expansions or new construction) or organic decline (e.g., closing of properties or sales of properties while maintaining operations by re-leasing) emissions will not be adjusted in the base year.

(7.1.3.4) Past years' recalculation

Select from:

☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.2) Select the name of the standard, protocol, or methodology you have used to collect activity data and calculate emissions.

Select all that apply

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: A Corporate Accounting and Reporting Standard (Revised Edition)

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Scope 2 Guidance

☑ The Greenhouse Gas Protocol: Corporate Value Chain (Scope 3) Standard

(7.3) Describe your organization's approach to reporting Scope 2 emissions.

	Scope 2, location-based	Scope 2, market-based	Comment
	Select from: ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, location-based figure	*Select from:* ☑ We are reporting a Scope 2, market-based figure	*n/a*

[Fixed row]

(7.4) Are there any sources (e.g. facilities, specific GHGs, activities, geographies, etc.) of Scope 1, Scope 2 or Scope 3 emissions that are within your selected reporting boundary which are not included in your disclosure?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.5) Provide your base year and base year emissions.

Scope 1

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

37000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 2 (location-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

91000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

87000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 3 category 1: Purchased goods and services

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

3000000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 3 category 2: Capital goods

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

50000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 3 category 3: Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

17000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 3 category 4: Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

369000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 3 category 5: Waste generated in operations

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

11000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 3 category 6: Business travel

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

34000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 3 category 7: Employee commuting

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

47000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 3 category 8: Upstream leased assets

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

1000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 3 category 11: Use of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

55000000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate

Scope 3 category 12: End of life treatment of sold products

(7.5.1) Base year end

12/31/2018

(7.5.2) Base year emissions (metric tons CO2e)

349000

(7.5.3) Methodological details

Figures are rounded and approximate
[Fixed row]

(7.6) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 1 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

	Gross global Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Methodological details
Reporting year	*30000*	*Figures are rounded and approximate*

[Fixed row]

(7.7) What were your organization’s gross global Scope 2 emissions in metric tons CO2e?

	Gross global Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)	Gross global Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e) (if applicable)	Methodological details
Reporting year	*66000*	*56000*	*figures are rounded and approximate.*

[Fixed row]

(7.8) Account for your organization’s gross global Scope 3 emissions, disclosing and explaining any exclusions.

Purchased goods and services

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

3000000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Annual procurement of goods and services, including direct and indirect spend, (Category 1) and capital expenditures (Category 2) from W.W. Grainger's general ledger (including Granger US, Grainger Canada, Granger Mexico, Cromwell, Zoro, and MonotaRO) are allocated to the most applicable categories within the detailed commodity database of USEPA's Supply Chain Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for US Industries and Commodities (USEEIO). Cradle-to-shelf GHG emissions are estimated by multiplying total spend in each detailed commodity category (converted to USD if applicable) by the emission factor specific to that category (including margins), adjusting for inflation. Figures are rounded and approximate.

Capital goods

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

50000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Spend-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Annual procurement of goods and services, including direct and indirect spend, (Category 1) and capital expenditures (Category 2) from W.W. Grainger's general ledger (including Granger US, Grainger Canada, Granger Mexico, Cromwell, Zoro, and MonotaRO) are allocated to the most applicable categories within the detailed commodity database of USEPA's Supply Chain Greenhouse Gas Emission Factors for US Industries and Commodities (USEEIO). Cradle-to-shelf GHG emissions are estimated by multiplying total spend in each detailed commodity category (converted to USD if applicable) by the emission factor specific to that category (including margins), adjusting for inflation. Figures are rounded and approximate.

Fuel-and-energy-related activities (not included in Scope 1 or 2)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

17000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Average data method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Total fuel and electricity usage data are multiplied by emission factors from United Kingdom's Department of Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and the International Energy Agency (IEA) to account for upstream emissions (fuel extraction, production/processing, transportation) and transmission and distribution (T&D) losses. Emissions factors for upstream emissions from purchased electricity and T&D losses are applied at the country level where available. If no country factor is available, the US is used as a proxy. Figures are rounded and approximate.

Upstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

369000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

70

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions from upstream transportation and distribution are first calculated for the Grainger US business unit, based on monthly diesel fuel spend for inbound, outbound and internal logistics services, and Yard Dog fuel consumption. Diesel fuel gallons are estimated by using the 2023 average diesel price (/gallon) sourced from the EIA and multiplying by annual diesel spend. Yard Dog fuel usage by location is added to total gallons consumed. GHG emissions are calculated by multiplying total diesel gallons by the diesel fuel emission factor from The Climate Registry (May 2023) - Tables 2.1 and 2.9. Emissions are also calculated for Cromwell's internal logistics from an XPO fuel usage report. The diesel emissions factor, sourced from DESNZ/DEFRA Conversion factors for Company Reporting Version 1.1 (2023), is applied to total gallons consumed to calculate emissions. To estimate emissions for other business units (Cromwell inbound/outbound, MonotaRO, Mexico and Canada), a gallons/cost of goods sold (COGS) intensity factor is created from the Grainger US data. The gallons/COGS intensity factor is applied to the COGS of each business unit to estimate gallons, and then the diesel fuel emissions factor is applied to calculate emissions. Upstream emissions were included in the 2023 calculations for the first time. Upstream emissions were calculated by multiplying the miles traveled by commute mode and electricity consumed

from WFH by well-to-tank (WTT) emissions factors from DESNZ's UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting and the International Energy Agency (IEA). Figures are rounded and approximate.

Waste generated in operations

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

11000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

80

(7.8.5) Please explain

The mass and disposal method of various waste materials generated across select US and Canadian locations is compiled and multiplied by emission factors from Table 9 of USEPA's Emission Factors for Greenhouse Gas Inventories from the Center for Corporate Climate Leadership (CCCL) according to the waste type and disposal method. Intensity factors (MTCO2e/sqft) are created for each location type from the US and Canada actual data to estimate emissions for remaining US, Canada and international locations. These intensity factors are applied to all locations missing actual data to estimate emissions across the entire portfolio. Figures are rounded and approximate.

Business travel

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

34000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Fuel-based method

☑ Distance-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

90

(7.8.5) Please explain

Hours flown for chartered jets was collected & assumed gallons/hour rate (FAA General Aviation, Table 5.1) was applied to estimate fuel consumption. The emissions factor was applied (2023 Climate Registry Default Emission Factors (Published June 2023)) & WTT emission factor (Source:DESNZ 2023, WTT - fuels). GUS (incl Zoro), GCAN, & Cromwell commercial air records are collected by online system & organized by cabin class, mileage/segment & haul type. The recent version of DEFRA & WTT emission factors are applied to estimate emissions from air travel. An intensity factor (MTCO2e/headcount) was created from GUS, GCAN, & Cromwell data to estimate emissions for Caribe, GMEX, MonotaRO, & India/GISPL. Rail was reported for GUS&GCAN. Emissions were calculated for rail distance-based travel & WTT emission factors using the current DEFRA values, & was not scaled up. Rental car data for Grainger portfolio is collected from Enterprise & National, & organized by gallons of fuel consumed by car & fuel type using SIPP codes from records. Emission factors for fuels (Diesel, Gasoline, Hybrid, & E10) were sourced from the current emission factors (2023 The Climate Registry) & DEFRA WTT emission factors, & applied to estimate GHG emissions from rental car travel. Enterprise average miles/car/day was used to extrapolate to US & Canada rental data. Distance-based estimates of fuel consumption were applied to cars (by market segment) based on the SIPPS classification, assumed to use "Petrol" fuel. Charging EV's was estimated using average 3.5miles/kWh, & national average egrid emission factor was applied & upstream electricity emission factors (USEPA, eGRID). Hotel stays for GUS&GCAN are collected through online system & organized by country of stay & # of nights. DEFRA emission factors by country are applied to estimate GHG Emissions from stays. An intensity factor (MTCO2e/headcount) was created from GUS & GCAN data to estimate emissions for Caribe, GMEX, MonotaRO, Cromwell, & India/GISPL. Emissions from travel using employee-owned vehicles is based on GUS & GCAN annual tracked mile data for sales reps & multiplying by average of DEFRA emission factors for distance-based "Average car-miles" & WTT for "Average car-miles" for vehicles assumed to be using "Petrol" fuel. An intensity factor was created from GUS & GCAN data to estimate emissions for reps with no tracked mileage.

Employee commuting

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

47000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Distance-based method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions from employee commuting were estimated for all staff across Grainger's entire operations. A commuter survey, primarily issued to Grainger U.S., provided the basis for average commute distance and mode statistics. Employees indicated which their daily commute distance and the commute methods they used each day, including working from home, driving alone, carpooling, taking public transportation, or biking/walking. These distances and commute methods were used to inform the % share of each commuting mode by employee type and the average round-trip distance by commuting mode and employee type. The daily emissions per employee were calculated by multiplying the % share of each commute mode by employee type by the applicable round trip average distance by the emissions factor sourced from USEPA's Center for Corporate Climate Leadership (CCCL), Table 10. The daily emissions factor per employee was then multiplied by the number of work days (240) and number of emplyoees by work type. Part-time employees were assumed to be the equivalent of 0.5 FTE. Grainger provided the % of fully remote workers by employee type. Work from home emissions were calculated using EcoAct's Homeworking Whitepaper assumption that an average workstation electric load for lighting and desktop is 150W. This load was assumed to be active for 8 hours per day worked remote. The final kWh value was multiplied by the national average eGrid emission factor to yield work from home emissions. Upstream emissions were included in the 2023 calculations for the first time. Upstream emissions were calculated by multiplying the miles traveled by commute mode and electricity consumed from WFH by well-to-tank (WTT) emissions factors from DESNZ's UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting and the International Energy Agency (IEA). Figures are rounded and approximate.

Upstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

1000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Asset-specific method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Grainger identified locations called "onsites," which had previously been included in Scope 1 and 2. These onites are locations which are owned and controlled by other organizations, i.e. military bases, campuses, etc., where Grainger products are kept on shelves amongst products from other organizations. Oftentimes a singular Grainger employee will report here to manage the retail of these products. Electricity and natural gas is modeled at the onsites by applying intensity factors for "warehouse and storage" energy per square foot to each location's square footage. Intensity factors are sourced from the 2018 Commercial Buildings Energy Consumption Survey (CBECS). Electricity emissions factors are applied by country and subregion and natural gas emissions factors are applied by country. Electricity factors are sourced from the USEPA eGRID2022 Year 2021 (released 01/30/2023) and natural gas factors are sourced from 2022 Climate Registry Default Emission Factors (May 2022) for the US and Guam, Environment Canada National Inventory Report 1990-2020 (2022 submission) for Canada, and UNFCCC CRF Implied Emission Factor Natural Gas; 2020 for Japan and Korea. Upstream emissions were calculated by multiplying the fuel and electricity consumed by well-to-tank (WTT) emissions factors from DESNZ's UK Government GHG Conversion Factors for Company Reporting and the International Energy Agency (IEA). Figures are rounded and approximate.

Downstream transportation and distribution

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Grainger customers use Grainger's shipping methods to receive products, they do not manage the shipments themselves. Emissions associated with transport and distribution are captured in upstream categories.

Processing of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

Grainger sells finished products, not raw materials.

Use of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

55000000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Methodology for direct use phase emissions, please specify :Product warranty and wattage information, quantity of products sold, and international business unit sales

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Grainger sells a wide variety of products, some with direct energy consumption during use phase, others without. Products with direct energy use were identified by reviewing the product categories, which is typically a group of 10-50 products. Given the breadth of Grainger's catalog, it would have proved too resource intensive to review each product itself, which is why the category level was chosen. Once relevant product categories were selected, product-specific warranty length and wattage information was gleaned from a Grainger database to formulate lifetime energy consumption estimates per product. The warranty length was assumed to be the average number of hours that the product was actively consuming energy. Multiplying this by the product's wattage yielded lifetime energy consumption, which was then multiplied by the number of units sold for that product. Lifecycle emissions, including both combustion and "well-to-tank" (WTT), or upstream, emissions associated with fuel and electricity consumption, were estimated. Sources for emission factors include the eGrid national average electricity emission factor, fuel-specific emission factors from The Climate Registry, and WTT factors from IEA and DESNZ. Refrigerant leakage emissions were also estimated for a few HVAC-related products. In the absence of product-level warranty and wattage information, category-level averages were applied. If the entire category did not have relevant information, the family (group of categories) averages were applied. The segment average was applied if family averages did not exist. One exception is the family, HVAC Thermostats and Controls - due to lack of reliable data, the segment average was used to estimate lifetime hours. International business unit emissions from direct energy consumed during use phase were estimated using their sales output and the Grainger US segment, family, and category averages for warranty and wattage. Figures are rounded and approximate.

End of life treatment of sold products

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Relevant, calculated

(7.8.2) Emissions in reporting year (metric tons CO2e)

349000

(7.8.3) Emissions calculation methodology

Select all that apply

☑ Waste-type-specific method

(7.8.4) Percentage of emissions calculated using data obtained from suppliers or value chain partners

0

(7.8.5) Please explain

Emissions were calculated from three waste streams (recycling, combustion and landfill) that result from the end-of-life disposal of Grainger's sold products. All products were assigned to either electronic waste or "other" municipal waste, and within both groups determinations were made as to whether the product was hazardous or non-hazardous. For the US, Canada, and Mexico, average disposal method breakdowns were attributed to each waste stream based on two EPA sources: 1) "National Overview: Facts and Figures on Materials, Wastes and Recycling" for non-hazardous, and 2) "Quantity of RCRA Hazardous Waste Generated and Managed" for hazardous. For Grainger's UK and Japan operations, international disposal rates (for recycling, combustion, and landfill) from Europa's "waste statistics" were used. It was assumed that globally, electronic waste is not combusted, only landfilled or recycled, so combustion rates from the above sources were removed and weighted allocations were made to the other two methods. Emission factors per short ton of waste were largely gathered from EPA's CCCL Table 9 (USEPA CCCL 2024), except for hazardous waste landfilling and combustion, which were sourced from Ecoinvent, as these factors are not represented in the CCCL Table 9. Emission calculations were based on the weight of products sold in each waste stream, multiplied by the disposal method percentages and their associated emission factor. One of Grainger's international business units, Cromwell, did not have weight data associated with all sales. In these instances, a Cromwell-specific average weight per unit was multiplied by the number of units sold by category, or segment when needed, to cover the gaps. Figures are rounded and approximate.

Downstream leased assets

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

No leased assets

Franchises

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

No franchises

Investments

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not relevant, explanation provided

(7.8.5) Please explain

No investments

Other (upstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not evaluated

Other (downstream)

(7.8.1) Evaluation status

Select from:

☑ Not evaluated

(7.8.5) Please explain

Not evaluated
[Fixed row]

(7.9) Indicate the verification/assurance status that applies to your reported emissions.

	Verification/assurance status
Scope 1	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 2 (location-based or market-based)	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place
Scope 3	*Select from:* ☑ Third-party verification or assurance process in place

[Fixed row]

(7.9.1) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 1 emissions, and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.1.1) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:
☑ Annual process

(7.9.1.2) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.1.3) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.1.4) Attach the statement

Grainger CY23 Verification Statement Limited Final (1).pdf

(7.9.1.5) Page/section reference

1-3 pages

(7.9.1.6) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.1.7) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.9.2) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 2 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 location-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:
☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:
☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Grainger CY23 Verification Statement Limited Final (1).pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

1-3 pages

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100

Row 2

(7.9.2.1) Scope 2 approach

Select from:
☑ Scope 2 market-based

(7.9.2.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.2.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.2.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.2.5) Attach the statement

Grainger CY23 Verification Statement Limited Final (1).pdf

(7.9.2.6) Page/ section reference

1-3 pages

(7.9.2.7) Relevant standard

Select from:

☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.2.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.9.3) Provide further details of the verification/assurance undertaken for your Scope 3 emissions and attach the relevant statements.

Row 1

(7.9.3.1) Scope 3 category

Select all that apply

- ☑ Scope 3: Capital goods
- ☑ Scope 3: Business travel
- ☑ Scope 3: Employee commuting
- ☑ Scope 3: Use of sold products
- ☑ Scope 3: Upstream leased assets
- ☑ Scope 3: Purchased goods and services
- ☑ Scope 3: Waste generated in operations
- ☑ Scope 3: End-of-life treatment of sold products
- ☑ Scope 3: Upstream transportation and distribution
- ☑ Scope 3: Fuel and energy-related activities (not included in Scopes 1 or 2)

(7.9.3.2) Verification or assurance cycle in place

Select from:

☑ Annual process

(7.9.3.3) Status in the current reporting year

Select from:

☑ Complete

(7.9.3.4) Type of verification or assurance

Select from:

☑ Limited assurance

(7.9.3.5) Attach the statement

Grainger CY23 Verification Statement Limited Final (1).pdf

(7.9.3.6) Page/section reference

1-3 Pages

(7.9.3.7) Relevant standard

Select from:
☑ ISO14064-3

(7.9.3.8) Proportion of reported emissions verified (%)

100
[Add row]

(7.10) How do your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined) for the reporting year compare to those of the previous reporting year?

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1) Identify the reasons for any change in your gross global emissions (Scope 1 and 2 combined), and for each of them specify how your emissions compare to the previous year.

Change in renewable energy consumption

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

60

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

0.1

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Our solar generation increased by approximately 200 MWh. This is a result of increased generation due to favorable weather with more sun. In the previous year, our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions were approximately 98,000 MTCO2e for location-based, therefore we arrived at 0.1% through ((60/98,000)*100).06% (rounded to 0.1%).*

Other emissions reduction activities

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5400

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

6

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

*Grainger is routinely evaluating its assets to ensure the business can meet a growing customer demand. As a result of this growing demand on our facilities, Grainger continues investing its branch, distribution center and administrative facilities on energy efficient projects and activities, such as the new building management control systems, HVAC upgrades, employee engagement, and lighting projects. Overall, improvements have saved an estimated 18,000 MWh in energy usage, which resulted in an approximate reduction of 5,400 MTCO2e in 2023. In the previous year, our Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions were approximately 98,000 MTCO2e for location-based, therefore we arrived at 5.5% through ((5,400/98,000)*100) 5.5%. (rouncded to 6%).*

Divestment

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:

☑ No change

Acquisitions

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

Mergers

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

Change in output

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

Change in methodology

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

Change in boundary

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

Change in physical operating conditions

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

Unidentified

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ No change

Other

(7.10.1.1) Change in emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2800

(7.10.1.2) Direction of change in emissions

Select from:
☑ Increased

(7.10.1.3) Emissions value (percentage)

3

(7.10.1.4) Please explain calculation

The increased emissions factors increased our emissions by approximately 2,800 MTCO2E or 3%. Grainger's usage went down 6% YoY. If emissions factors were flat YoY, emissions would have also decreased 6%, causing our location based scope 1 and 2 to be approximatley 93,000.
[Fixed row]

(7.10.2) Are your emissions performance calculations in 7.10 and 7.10.1 based on a location-based Scope 2 emissions figure or a market-based Scope 2 emissions figure?

Select from:
☑ Location-based

(7.12) Are carbon dioxide emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.12.1) Provide the emissions from biogenic carbon relevant to your organization in metric tons CO2.

	CO2 emissions from biogenic carbon (metric tons CO2)	Comment
	300	*The biogenic carbon is related to E10, E85, and E100.*

[Fixed row]

(7.15) Does your organization break down its Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.15.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by greenhouse gas type and provide the source of each used global warming potential (GWP).

Row 1

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CO2

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

27000

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 2

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:

☑ CH4

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

50

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:

☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 3

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ N2O

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

80

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)

Row 4

(7.15.1.1) Greenhouse gas

Select from:
☑ HFCs

(7.15.1.2) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons of CO2e)

3000

(7.15.1.3) GWP Reference

Select from:
☑ IPCC Fifth Assessment Report (AR5 – 100 year)
[Add row]

(7.16) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 and 2 emissions by country/area.

Canada

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

5000

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

3000

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

3000

China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

70

Czechia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

50

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

30

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

40

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

10

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

10

Hungary

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

10

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

10

India

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

300

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

300

Indonesia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

30

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

200

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

200

Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

10

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

10

Japan

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

8000

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

900

Malaysia

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

30

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

30

Mexico

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

2000

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

2000

Panama

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

100

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

100

Poland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

20

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

20

Republic of Korea

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

400

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

400

South Africa

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

50

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

200

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

160

Thailand

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

20

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

10

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

10

United Arab Emirates

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

2000

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

600

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

0

United States of America

(7.16.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

22000

(7.16.2) Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)

52000

(7.16.3) Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)

49000
[Fixed row]

(7.17) Indicate which gross global Scope 1 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply
☑ By business division
☑ By activity

(7.17.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 1 emissions (metric ton CO2e)
Row 1	*Enterprise*	*7000*
Row 2	*Grainger Branch*	*11000*
Row 3	*Distribution Center*	*8000*
Row 4	*Warehouse*	*1000*
Row 5	*Corporate Office*	*3000*
Row 7	*Data Center*	*0*

[Add row]

(7.17.3) Break down your total gross global Scope 1 emissions by business activity.

	Activity	Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Stationary Combustion*	*23000*
Row 2	*Refrigerant*	*3000*
Row 4	*Mobile combustion*	*4000*

[Add row]

(7.20) Indicate which gross global Scope 2 emissions breakdowns you are able to provide.

Select all that apply

☑ By business division

(7.20.1) Break down your total gross global Scope 2 emissions by business division.

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 1	*Enterprise*	*0*	*0*
Row 2	*Data Center*	*1000*	*0*
Row 3	*Grainger Branch*	*12000*	*10000*
Row 4	*Corporate Office*	*14000*	*12000*
Row 5	*Distribution Center*	*36000*	*31000*

	Business division	Scope 2, location-based (metric tons CO2e)	Scope 2, market-based (metric tons CO2e)
Row 6	*Warehouse*	*3000*	*3000*

[Add row]

(7.22) Break down your gross Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions between your consolidated accounting group and other entities included in your response.

Consolidated accounting group

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

30000

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

66000

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

56000

(7.22.4) Please explain

All of Grainger's entities are included in our consolidated accounting group and financial statements, and are included in our total emissions figures.

All other entities

(7.22.1) Scope 1 emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.2) Scope 2, location-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.3) Scope 2, market-based emissions (metric tons CO2e)

0

(7.22.4) Please explain

All of Grainger's entities are included in our consolidated accounting group and financial statements, and are included in our total emissions figures.
[Fixed row]

(7.23) Is your organization able to break down your emissions data for any of the subsidiaries included in your CDP response?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26) Allocate your emissions to your customers listed below according to the goods or services you have sold them in this reporting period.

Row 1

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

515000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

930

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 2

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

515000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

1800

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 3

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

19700000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

35

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 4

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

19700000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

70

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 5

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4600000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 6

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4600000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

15

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 7

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

6800000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 8

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

6800000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

25

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 9

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

9000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

15

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 10

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

9000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

30

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 11

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

12300000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

20

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 12

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

12300000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

40

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 13

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 14

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 15

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

42500000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

75

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 16

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

42500000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

145

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 17

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

760000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 18

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

760000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 19

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

13000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

25

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 20

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

13000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

45

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 21

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

5000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 22

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

5000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

15

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 23

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

14700000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

25

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 24

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

14700000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

50

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 25

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2800000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 26

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2800000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 27

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4700000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 28

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4700000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

15

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 29

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1400000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 30

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

1400000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 31

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

6400000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 32

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

6400000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

20

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 33

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

600000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 34

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

600000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 35

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2700000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 36

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2700000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 37

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

15300000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

30

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 38

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

15300000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

50

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 39

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 40

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 41

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

6400000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 42

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

6400000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

20

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 43

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

11700000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

20

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 44

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

11700000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

40

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 45

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 46

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

0

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 47

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

3500000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 48

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

3500000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 49

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 50

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

4000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

15

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 51

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2900000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 52

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

2900000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

10

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 53

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

8900000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

15

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 54

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

8900000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

30

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 55

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

9000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

15

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 56

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

9000000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

30

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 57

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

800000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 58

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

800000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

5

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 59

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

35200000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

65

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 60

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:

☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:

☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

35200000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

120

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 61

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 1

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:
☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:
☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

600000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Natural gas for heating buildings and fuel for fleet vehicles

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.

Row 62

(7.26.1) Requesting member

Select from:

(7.26.2) Scope of emissions

Select from:
☑ Scope 2: market-based

(7.26.4) Allocation level

Select from:
☑ Company wide

(7.26.6) Allocation method

Select from:

☑ Allocation based on the market value of products purchased

(7.26.7) Unit for market value or quantity of goods/services supplied

Select from:

☑ Currency

(7.26.8) Market value or quantity of goods/services supplied to the requesting member

600000

(7.26.9) Emissions in metric tonnes of CO2e

0

(7.26.10) Uncertainty (±%)

5

(7.26.11) Major sources of emissions

Electricity to power buildings

(7.26.12) Allocation verified by a third party?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.26.13) Please explain how you have identified the GHG source, including major limitations to this process and assumptions made

Grainger uses the Greenhouse Gas Protocol and the US EPA e-grid to identify GHG emissions and carbon equivalents for energy consumption.

(7.26.14) Where published information has been used, please provide a reference

Figures are rounded and approximate.
[Add row]

(7.29) What percentage of your total operational spend in the reporting year was on energy?

Select from:
☑ More than 0% but less than or equal to 5%

(7.30) Select which energy-related activities your organization has undertaken.

	Indicate whether your organization undertook this energy-related activity in the reporting year
Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstocks)	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of purchased or acquired heat	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of purchased or acquired cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Generation of electricity, heat, steam, or cooling	*Select from:* ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(7.30.1) Report your organization’s energy consumption totals (excluding feedstocks) in MWh.

Consumption of fuel (excluding feedstock)

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1000

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

142000

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

143000

Consumption of purchased or acquired electricity

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

28000

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

136000

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

164000

Consumption of self-generated non-fuel renewable energy

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

1000

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

1000

Total energy consumption

(7.30.1.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.1.2) MWh from renewable sources

31000

(7.30.1.3) MWh from non-renewable sources

278000

(7.30.1.4) Total (renewable and non-renewable) MWh

309000
[Fixed row]

(7.30.6) Select the applications of your organization's consumption of fuel.

	Indicate whether your organization undertakes this fuel application
Consumption of fuel for the generation of electricity	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of heat	*Select from:* ☑ Yes
Consumption of fuel for the generation of steam	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for the generation of cooling	*Select from:* ☑ No
Consumption of fuel for co-generation or tri-generation	*Select from:* ☑ No

[Fixed row]

(7.30.7) State how much fuel in MWh your organization has consumed (excluding feedstocks) by fuel type.

Sustainable biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate

Other biomass

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate

Other renewable fuels (e.g. renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

1000

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate

Coal

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate

Oil

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:

☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate

Gas

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

142000

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate

Other non-renewable fuels (e.g. non-renewable hydrogen)

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ Unable to confirm heating value

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

0

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate

Total fuel

(7.30.7.1) Heating value

Select from:
☑ HHV

(7.30.7.2) Total fuel MWh consumed by the organization

143000

(7.30.7.8) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate
[Fixed row]

(7.30.9) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and cooling your organization has generated and consumed in the reporting year.

Electricity

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

8000

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

1000

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

8000

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

1000

Heat

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Steam

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

Cooling

(7.30.9.1) Total Gross generation (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.2) Generation that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.3) Gross generation from renewable sources (MWh)

0

(7.30.9.4) Generation from renewable sources that is consumed by the organization (MWh)

0
[Fixed row]

(7.30.14) Provide details on the electricity, heat, steam, and/or cooling amounts that were accounted for at a zero or near-zero emission factor in the market-based Scope 2 figure reported in 7.7.

Row 1

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ United States of America

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Unbundled procurement of energy attribute certificates (EACs)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Wind and multiple renewable sources

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

11000

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ US-REC

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate

Row 2

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:
☑ Japan

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:
☑ Default delivered electricity from the grid (e.g. standard product offering by an energy supplier), supported by energy attribute certificates

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:

☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:

☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify :Hydro power, Biomass, multiple renewable sources

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

14000

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:

☑ NFC – Renewable

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:

☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate

Row 3

(7.30.14.1) Country/area

Select from:

☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.2) Sourcing method

Select from:

☑ Retail supply contract with an electricity supplier (retail green electricity)

(7.30.14.3) Energy carrier

Select from:
☑ Electricity

(7.30.14.4) Low-carbon technology type

Select from:
☑ Renewable energy mix, please specify **:**Mulitple renewable sources

(7.30.14.5) Low-carbon energy consumed via selected sourcing method in the reporting year (MWh)

3000

(7.30.14.6) Tracking instrument used

Select from:
☑ Contract

(7.30.14.7) Country/area of origin (generation) of the low-carbon energy or energy attribute

Select from:
☑ United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.14.8) Are you able to report the commissioning or re-powering year of the energy generation facility?

Select from:
☑ No

(7.30.14.10) Comment

Figures are rounded and approximate
[Add row]

(7.30.16) Provide a breakdown by country/area of your electricity/heat/steam/cooling consumption in the reporting year.

Canada

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

11000

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

11000.00

China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

100

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

100.00

Czechia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

70

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

70.00

Hong Kong SAR, China

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

10

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

10.00

Hungary

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

40

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

40.00

India

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

400

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

400.00

Indonesia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

200

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

200.00

Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

20.00

Japan

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

16000

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

16000.00

Malaysia

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

40

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

40.00

Mexico

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

4000

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

4000.00

Panama

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

400

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

400.00

Poland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

30

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

30.00

Republic of Korea

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

1000

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

1000.00

South Africa

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

200

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

200.00

Thailand

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

20

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

20.00

United Arab Emirates

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

0.00

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

3000

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

3000.00

United States of America

(7.30.16.1) Consumption of purchased electricity (MWh)

127000

(7.30.16.2) Consumption of self-generated electricity (MWh)

1000

(7.30.16.4) Consumption of purchased heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.5) Consumption of self-generated heat, steam, and cooling (MWh)

0

(7.30.16.6) Total electricity/heat/steam/cooling energy consumption (MWh)

128000.00
[Fixed row]

(7.45) Describe your gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions for the reporting year in metric tons CO2e per unit currency total revenue and provide any additional intensity metrics that are appropriate to your business operations.

Row 1

(7.45.1) Intensity figure

0.000005

(7.45.2) Metric numerator (Gross global combined Scope 1 and 2 emissions, metric tons CO2e)

86000

(7.45.3) Metric denominator

Select from:

☑ unit total revenue

(7.45.4) Metric denominator: Unit total

16478000000

(7.45.5) Scope 2 figure used

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.45.6) % change from previous year

13

(7.45.7) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Decreased

(7.45.8) Reasons for change

Select all that apply

☑ Other emissions reduction activities

☑ Change in revenue

(7.45.9) Please explain

This metric decreased by 13% because of an absolute emissions reduction largely driven by emissions reduction activities, such as LED lighting projects, HVAC and building management system installations, and renewable energy installations. Changes in conversion factors year-over-year, and an increase in revenue year over-year also attributed to the decrease.
[Add row]

(7.52) Provide any additional climate-related metrics relevant to your business.

Row 1

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

85000000

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Pounds of waste recycled

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

N/a - not an intensity metric

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

18

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:

☑ Increased

(7.52.7) Please explain

2023 was the first full-year in which our previous recycling partner, Avangard, had been acquired by WM. With WM handling our waste and recycling in the United States of America, we had better access to our data than we did previously which allowed us to capture more diverted materials.

Row 3

(7.52.1) Description

Select from:
☑ Waste

(7.52.2) Metric value

23600000

(7.52.3) Metric numerator

Pounds of non-hazardous waste landfilled

(7.52.4) Metric denominator (intensity metric only)

N/a - not an intensity metric

(7.52.5) % change from previous year

0.4

(7.52.6) Direction of change

Select from:
☑ Decreased

(7.52.7) Please explain

2023 was the first full-year in which our previous recycling partner, Avangard, had been acquired by WM. With WM handling our waste and recycling in the United States of America, we had better access to our data than we did previously which allowed us to capture more diverted materials.
[Add row]

(7.53) Did you have an emissions target that was active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply
☑ Absolute target

(7.53.1) Provide details of your absolute emissions targets and progress made against those targets.

Row 1

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:
☑ Abs 1

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:
☑ No, and we do not anticipate setting one in the next two years

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

07/01/2020

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:
☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2018

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

37000

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

87000

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

124000.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

30

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

86800.000

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

30000

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

56000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

86000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

102.15

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Achieved

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target covered Grainger's organization-wide Scope 1 & Scope 2 absolute emissions. The target did not include Scope 3 emissions, as Grainger is focused on reducing emissions that are in our direct control.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Grainger's climate target to reduce total absolute global Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by 30% by 2030 from a 2018 was set using the Science-Based Target's initiatives guidelines for following a pathway aligned with well-below 2 degrees Celsius (for Scope 1 and 2 only).

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

(7.53.1.86) List the emissions reduction initiatives which contributed most to achieving this target

In order to achieve our 30% reduction in Market Based Scope 1 and 2 emissions, we prioritized high efficiency life cycle replacements projects, lighting retrofits, optimization of energy usage via building management systems (BMS), solar installations, and hydrogen fuel cell technology for our powered industrial equipment (PIE).

Row 2

(7.53.1.1) Target reference number

Select from:

☑ Abs 2

(7.53.1.2) Is this a science-based target?

Select from:

☑ No, and we do not anticipate setting one in the next two years

(7.53.1.5) Date target was set

10/24/2023

(7.53.1.6) Target coverage

Select from:

☑ Organization-wide

(7.53.1.7) Greenhouse gases covered by target

Select all that apply

☑ Carbon dioxide (CO2)

☑ Methane (CH4)

☑ Nitrous oxide (N2O)

☑ Hydrofluorocarbons (HFCs)

(7.53.1.8) Scopes

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2

(7.53.1.9) Scope 2 accounting method

Select from:

☑ Market-based

(7.53.1.11) End date of base year

12/31/2018

(7.53.1.12) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

37000

(7.53.1.13) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

87000

(7.53.1.31) Base year total Scope 3 emissions covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

0.000

(7.53.1.32) Total base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

124000.000

(7.53.1.33) Base year Scope 1 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 1

100.0

(7.53.1.34) Base year Scope 2 emissions covered by target as % of total base year emissions in Scope 2

100.0

(7.53.1.53) Base year emissions covered by target in all selected Scopes as % of total base year emissions in all selected Scopes

100.0

(7.53.1.54) End date of target

12/31/2030

(7.53.1.55) Targeted reduction from base year (%)

50

(7.53.1.56) Total emissions at end date of target covered by target in all selected Scopes (metric tons CO2e)

62000.000

(7.53.1.57) Scope 1 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

30000

(7.53.1.58) Scope 2 emissions in reporting year covered by target (metric tons CO2e)

56000

(7.53.1.77) Total emissions in reporting year covered by target in all selected scopes (metric tons CO2e)

86000.000

(7.53.1.78) Land-related emissions covered by target

Select from:

☑ No, it does not cover any land-related emissions (e.g. non-FLAG SBT)

(7.53.1.79) % of target achieved relative to base year

61.29

(7.53.1.80) Target status in reporting year

Select from:

☑ Underway

(7.53.1.82) Explain target coverage and identify any exclusions

This target covered Grainger's organization-wide Scope 1 & Scope 2 absolute emissions. The target did not include Scope 3 emissions, as Grainger is focused on reducing emissions that are in our direct control.

(7.53.1.83) Target objective

Grainger's climate target to reduce total absolute global Scope 1 and Scope 2 emissions by 50% by 2030 from a 2018 was set using the Science-Based Target's initiatives guidelines for following a pathway aligned with 1.5 degrees Celsius (for Scope 1 and 2 only).

(7.53.1.84) Plan for achieving target, and progress made to the end of the reporting year

We achieved our original goal of a 30% reduction in Scope 1 and 2 (Market-Based) emissions by 2030 with a baseline year of 2018 in the 2023 annual reporting cycle. The key initiatives that drove the reduction in Scope 1 and 2 reductions include solar panel installation and increased renewable energy usage at facilities, improving technology and efficiency in our building management systems, implementing high-efficiency life cycle replacements, and transitioning from Powered Industrial Equipment (PIE) batteries to hydrogen fuel cells. As we look towards achieving our updated 50% reduction target, we expect those same initiatives to continue to help us achieve our target.

(7.53.1.85) Target derived using a sectoral decarbonization approach

Select from:

☑ No

[Add row]

(7.54) Did you have any other climate-related targets that were active in the reporting year?

Select all that apply

☑ No other climate-related targets

(7.55) Did you have emissions reduction initiatives that were active within the reporting year? Note that this can include those in the planning and/or implementation phases.

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.55.1) Identify the total number of initiatives at each stage of development, and for those in the implementation stages, the estimated CO2e savings.

	Number of initiatives	Total estimated annual CO2e savings in metric tonnes CO2e (only for rows marked *)
Under investigation	*200*	*`Numeric input*
To be implemented	*60*	*9000*
Implementation commenced	*300*	*12000*
Implemented	*90*	*4600*
Not to be implemented	*0*	*`Numeric input*

[Fixed row]

(7.55.2) Provide details on the initiatives implemented in the reporting year in the table below.

Row 1

(7.55.2.1) Initiative category & Initiative type

Energy efficiency in buildings
☑ Other, please specify :Energy Efficient Life Cycle Replacements and Building Management Systems

(7.55.2.2) Estimated annual CO2e savings (metric tonnes CO2e)

5500

(7.55.2.3) Scope(s) or Scope 3 category(ies) where emissions savings occur

Select all that apply

☑ Scope 1

☑ Scope 2 (location-based)

☑ Scope 2 (market-based)

(7.55.2.4) Voluntary/Mandatory

Select from:

☑ Voluntary

(7.55.2.5) Annual monetary savings (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

337000

(7.55.2.6) Investment required (unit currency – as specified in C0.4)

15600000

(7.55.2.7) Payback period

Select from:

☑ No payback

(7.55.2.8) Estimated lifetime of the initiative

Select from:

☑ 16-20 years

(7.55.2.9) Comment

HVAC Unit Improvements, LED Lighting Retrofits, and Building Management Systems Installations.
[Add row]

(7.55.3) What methods do you use to drive investment in emissions reduction activities?

Row 1

(7.55.3.1) Method

Select from:
☑ Dedicated budget for energy efficiency

(7.55.3.2) Comment

Each year Grainger dedicates a portion of its capital and expense budget toward energy efficiency projects within its real estate portfolio.
[Add row]

(7.73) Are you providing product level data for your organization's goods or services?

Select from:
☑ No, I am not providing data

(7.74) Do you classify any of your existing goods and/or services as low-carbon products?

Select from:
☑ Yes

(7.74.1) Provide details of your products and/or services that you classify as low-carbon products.

Row 1

(7.74.1.1) Level of aggregation

Select from:

☑ Group of products or services

(7.74.1.2) Taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low-carbon

Select from:

☑ No taxonomy used to classify product(s) or service(s) as low carbon

(7.74.1.3) Type of product(s) or service(s)

Power

☑ Other, please specify **:** Offering of "environmentally preferable" Maintenance, Repair and Operations (MRO) product line (e.g., HVAC, motors, lighting, etc.)

(7.74.1.4) Description of product(s) or service(s)

Grainger's Environmentally Preferable Products (EPP) offer products that are certified as low-carbon or enable avoided emissions through transparent reporting so customers can compare data and select a sustainable option. Examples of certified low-carbon designations include Carbonfree, EnergyStar and DLC Approved. We engage with key suppliers, and we provide Environmental Product Declarations on Grainger.com where available so customers may compare and calculate product life cycle emissions. We continue to engage with suppliers to add more low carbon certified products such as CarbonTrust and qualified calculations to avoid emissions as new EPP products are introduced to Grainger's portfolio.

(7.74.1.5) Have you estimated the avoided emissions of this low-carbon product(s) or service(s)

Select from:

☑ No

(7.74.1.13) Revenue generated from low-carbon product(s) or service(s) as % of total revenue in the reporting year

4
[Add row]

(7.79) Has your organization canceled any project-based carbon credits within the reporting year?

Select from:

☑ No

C13. Further information & sign off

(13.1) Indicate if any environmental information included in your CDP response (not already reported in 7.9.1/2/3, 8.9.1/2/3/4, and 9.3.2) is verified and/or assured by a third party?

	Other environmental information included in your CDP response is verified and/or assured by a third party
	Select from: ☑ Yes

[Fixed row]

(13.1.1) Which data points within your CDP response are verified and/or assured by a third party, and which standards were used?

Row 1

(13.1.1.1) Environmental issue for which data has been verified and/or assured

Select all that apply

☑ Climate change

(13.1.1.2) Disclosure module and data verified and/or assured

Environmental performance – Climate change

☑ Waste data

(13.1.1.3) Verification/assurance standard

General standards

☑ ISAE 3000

(13.1.1.4) Further details of the third-party verification/assurance process

Grainger engaged a third-party provider, Apex, to perform verification of quantities for recycled and landfilled waste in pounds. Apex performed the verification in accordance with guidelines for external Assurance of Sustainability Reports and International Standard on Assurance Engagements (ISAE) 3000 Revised, Assurance Engagements Other than Audits or Reviews of Historical Financial Information (effective for assurance reports dated on or after Dec. 15, 2015), issued by the International Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. A materiality threshold of 5-percent was set for the assurance process.

(13.1.1.5) Attach verification/assurance evidence/report (optional)

668f042dc0bd1630f80e41f6_Grainger - CY23 Water and Waste Assurance Statement Limited.pdf
[Add row]

(13.3) Provide the following information for the person that has signed off (approved) your CDP response.

(13.3.1) Job title

Laurie Thomson

(13.3.2) Corresponding job category

Select from:

☑ Other C-Suite Officer
[Fixed row]